VENTURES IN INTER-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

By SAMUEL GUY INMAN
Author of *Problems in Pan Americanism, Intervention in Mexico,* etc.

MISSIONARY EDUCATION MOVEMENT
OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA
NEW YORK

Publisher's Note

Samuel Guy Inman is Secretary of the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America with headquarters in New York, but for the period of ten years during which he has occupied this position he has made five extended trips through Latin America and has visited one or more of the Latin American countries each year. Prior to his affiliation with the Committee Mr. Inman served for ten years as a missionary in Mexico. He has been invited to give courses of lectures in a number of the prominent universities of the Southern republics and is now, in addition to his other duties, Instructor in International Relations in Columbia University. Besides the many books and reports that he has written in English interpreting the problems of Latin America to the United States he is the author of a book entitled *Hacia la Solidaridad Americana* which was written in Spanish and published by one of the principal houses in Madrid for circulation in Latin America.

In planning *Ventures in Inter-American Friendship* the publishers asked Mr. Inman to provide a short book for discussion groups that would show the trends of thought on social, political, and religious problems in Latin America today in their relationship to the Evangelical movement, and, so far as possible, by the selection of significant statements from the writings and speeches of Latin American leaders themselves to reflect their attitudes on these questions.

The Congress on Christian Work in South America, held in Montevideo in April, 1925, illustrated in its plan, its method of discussion, and its reports so many important aspects of the present situation facing the Evangelical forces that a part of the book is given to a summary and an interpretation of this important gathering. The full reports of the Commissions of the Congress form a most valuable source of fresh and reliable information on South America today. They are published in two volumes by the Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, under the title *Christian Work in South America.*

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Venture at Montevideo	5
II.	Some Fruits of the Venture	27
III.	The Night of the Open Heart	45
IV.	Changing South America	67
V.	Political and Economic Relations	89
VI.	Bases for Inter-American Friendship	121

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

Chapter I

1. If you were called upon to attend an international conference in South America, as several North Americans were asked recently to attend the Montevideo Congress, with what preconceptions would you set out, regarding the civilization, the government, the culture, the social and religious conditions of South America? A frank statement on this by each member of a discussion group at the beginning will help greatly in discussing the material presented in this book.
2. What interests should be uppermost in the minds of North American Christians in visiting South America? (The same question should also be considered at the conclusion of this whole study.)
3. How far do the spiritual problems of South America seem similar and how far different from those of Europe and North America?
4. What seem to be the forces that are influencing South America toward materialism?
5. Under what limitations would it seem right for North American Christians to initiate a conference to deal with the spiritual problems of South America?
6. Were the organizers of the Montevideo Congress right or wrong in inviting persons outside the Evangelical circles?
7. How far are congregational singing, Bible reading and prayer, and the organization of formal churches essential in presenting the gospel message in South America?
8. How far is a Christian worker justified in using indirect methods and in working with individuals or groups that are unwilling to have any pressure put on them to join the church?

I

THE VENTURE AT MONTEVIDEO

"The great Argentine, Juan Bautista Alberdi, has well said: 'Suppress religion and you mutilate man. Religion is the most powerful principle in the development of humanity.' However splendid all other service rendered to South America may be, the cap-sheaf of the whole is the reaching of the hearts of individual men and of society with the teachings of Jesus Christ and the securing of loyalty to His person and aims."

These words lead at once into the heart of the Congress on Christian Work in South America which was held in Montevideo in the spring of 1925. They are to be found in the report of the Commission on Evangelism. Many of those who participated in the Congress considered that the greatest question to be faced was not a matter of this or that church or of this or that method, but the question as to whether South America could be brought to a new spiritual basis for its life. The conviction that the life of the continent depended on such a basis and that it could be found in the life and teachings of Jesus was reiterated in many forms and at many times.

The Congress, called under the auspices of the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America, which represents thirty mission boards of North America doing work in Latin America, brought together representatives of eighteen nations, thirty-five organizations, and some seventeen denominations. About two thirds of the delegates came from South America and one third from the

United States. There were three delegates from Spain, two from France, and one each from Switzerland, Italy, and Great Britain. The Congress met for a ten-days' discussion of the great questions related to education, religion, social movements, literature, public health, and cooperation among the spiritual forces of the world. How timely was this gathering is indicated further in the report that has been already quoted:

It is evident that the present moment offers exceptional opportunities for evangelism in South America. There are stirring in the southern continent certain great movements which not only afford opportunities for the entrance of the gospel, but also make it incumbent upon Evangelical Christianity to spread the gospel message broadcast. Two outstanding reasons may be given for a more active propagation of the gospel in South America just now. (1) There is a growing spirit of materialism as opposed to a spiritual interpretation of life, and an accompanying tendency to throw overboard anything that savors of religion; and (2) there is a rapidly growing tendency to question all traditional modes of thought and action, which finds constant expression in the political, social, and religious realms and is particularly noticeable in the realm of religion.

While not so notably true in the northern sections of South America, the southern republics are entering upon a period of intensive commercial and industrial development which is giving a great material impulse to each country, but is at the same time shifting the emphasis away from the cultural, religious evaluation of life to one that is strongly materialistic. Within the past few years there has been a vast increase in the connections, both commercial and industrial, between Latin American lands and both Europe and North America. The result has been that large numbers of representatives from Europe and North America, interested in the material profit, have gone into these countries with their capital and plans for commercial expansion, changing the character and outlook of whole republics.

There has been also a close relationship in spirit between the

French people and the peoples of South America. Not Spain but France has furnished the model in matters cultural and philosophical for most of the South American peoples; and it is well known, of course, that a strong materialistic note has been for a long period dominant in French thinking and writing. While this has more directly affected the governing and influential classes, yet the labor groups today are almost completely dominated by this materialistic emphasis. It comes to them not alone through the arguments and ideas of upper-class people but through their direct relationship with labor movements in Russia and in other parts of the world, which are confessedly opposed to anything like religion.

The forces of the world which contribute to the materialization of South America are active; is it not time that the more spiritually minded people make their contribution as well?

Dr. J. Pou Orfila, a professor in the University of Montevideo, says: "Unfortunately, in contemporary culture the material element predominates over the spiritual element. Many of the evils which afflict humanity today have come because of the excessive attention given to the material phases of life and the slight attention given to the moral and spiritual side. More than once we have talked of the spiritual and moral bankruptcy of the present capitalistic civilization. Again youth must be taught to construct its inner life on a basis of sound interests and noble desires; not to content itself with inferior ideals."

The Committee of Arrangements for the Montevideo Congress made this announcement in Bulletin No. 2, issued before the Congress met:

Many of the great leaders among government officials, heads of universities, authors, and distinguished publicists are now urging the necessity of finding a spiritual basis for national and personal life. It would be easy to cite large numbers of inspiring

illustrations of this fact. This, particularly, is the challenging reason for the Congress on Christian Work in South America. A noted South American educator said recently that he believed that the Congress, if directed rightly, had a peculiar opportunity at this most propitious time to unite the new forces now arising in a call to the whole continent for a turning from the material to a fresh emphasis on the spiritual. Certainly it ought to mean much for all concerned to have a hundred representatives of English-speaking America and a hundred leaders of Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking America, accompanied by a number of spiritual leaders from Europe, sit down together for some two weeks in the city of Montevideo to discuss how the great materialistic emphasis noted in all modern life can be overcome by the emphasis on the teachings of Christ. If the spiritual forces are to prevail, there must be found some new ways of alliance between them and the great social, economic, and educational renaissance. Otherwise, the very advancements of modern science will favor the material at the expense of the spiritual. This is the great challenge facing the Montevideo Congress.

The eyes of the Christian world were upon Montevideo in those memorable ten days of March and April, 1925. Not only did those interested in the missionary progress of Christianity center their attention on Montevideo, but also those who were anxious about the international relations of the world. These were particularly critical times in South America. Other conferences had been held on that continent during recent years from which much as regards international friendship was expected, but they had not always given the desired results. Interior difficulties pressed upon many of the countries and relations between various South American nations were strained. While commercial relations had been growing between the United States and South America, not so much could be said concerning spiritual relations. For the first time in the history of the continent some fifty North

Americans interested only in spiritual, moral, and social relations went to South America. Many commercial, diplomatic, and scientific missions had preceded them, but this was a great spiritual venture unparalleled in the history of the continent, in which such a large number of North Americans set forth to discover new friendships in the southern continent.

They went, not simply as delegates to a congress, but as visitors to the great capitals of South American nations to exchange ideas with the leaders of thought and of spiritual forces in these centers. On the steamer going south Dr. Robert E. Speer had said to the group, "Above all things, let us return having made a few devoted friends with whom we can continue our fellowship, exchanging books and ideas and mutually aiding in maintaining ideals."

All of the delegates were entertained in the same hotel for some two weeks. A committee of hostesses arranged their seating at meals so that those from the different nations and organizations became acquainted and formed a friendly basis for mutual understanding. This was the first time in the history of many of the churches that delegates from the various South American countries had come together. Meetings of denominational groups, representatives of interdenominational schools and presses, groups interested in temperance, in literature, in women's movements, in student work, in labor, in international peace, and in many other questions found time during the luncheon hour, at dinner, or at afternoon tea to consult together over their special interests. Fellowship was one of the great results of the Congress. Those who noted the stiff formality of the delegates in the beginning and the way they commingled during the latter part of the

Congress realized how much this fellowship meant. As the years go by and friendships begun at the Hotel Pocitos ripen into fellowship in large service for the nations, the significance of living together during those memorable days will grow in appreciation.

Montevideo, then, was not so much a conference *about* South America as a conference *with* South Americans. The Congress came to regard itself not so much as the meeting of delegates of a "missionary" group to determine their problems and attitudes toward a mission field as a meeting of a selected group of Evangelicals with a cross-section of the South American people to determine how all might work together in solving South America's problems, which, with certain local differences, seem to be the world's problems.

To return to the spiritual situation, the report on Evangelism presented to the Congress emphasized the opportuneness of this time for the gathering, stating that the interest in the Bible and in Jesus Christ was never greater than at the present moment. The Bible, which for generations has been a closed book to the thinking classes in South America, now begins to have for them a new interest, if in many cases only a literary interest. It is appreciated at least that this is great literature. Many thinking men see in it, however, more than mere literature; and they read its glowing pages in search of solutions for those problems that perplex them. The day of the "Spanish Christ," the tragic figure that has symbolized the spirit of religion in South America hitherto, is giving place to the strong, virile figure of the Jesus of history. As an illustration of this conviction, one of the books published recently by the Department of Education in Mexico, copies of which were sent to every library in the country,

was an edition of the New Testament with an introduction by Tolstoy. All this means that the general atmosphere is becoming increasingly favorable for the proclamation of Christian truth.

In spite of this spiritual interest seen now and then, the report points out the great indifference of the masses:

> Possibly two per cent of the mass of population in the River Plate republics is reached by all the churches taken together in a way which actually touches their lives. Allowing that there be sixteen hundred thousand families, and two million children, a five-per-cent influence would require that there be a hundred thousand children in receipt of definite Christian teaching in connection with some church association. Those under Protestant influences are possibly twelve thousand, and they certainly aggregate more than one eighth of the whole. In country districts, and over very large areas, not more than ten per cent of the children are even baptized into the Church, and the marriage factor (even of civil marriage) is very low. The authorities at Rome are under no illusion as to the conditions that prevail, but they are in no situation to assist, for, as is perfectly well known, they have no reserve of teaching staff on which to draw except the product of the seminaries of Spain, and the standard of education in these institutions is itself so low that their help is practically valueless.

Facing such conditions, the majority of the Congress were not particularly interested in discussing the theological differences between Romanism and Protestantism, or the relative value of the Evangelical sects, but they felt that their great duty was to find the best methods of reaching the people with the spiritual message of Christ. Thus the Congress declared:

> We consider that the propagation of spiritism and theosophy in several South American countries, together with the new

interest in the religious problem which has been noted in this Report, are evidence of a reaction against materialism and of a deep-seated sense of loneliness and a desire for spiritual companionship, and that this constitutes a call for a fresh interpretation of the place that belongs to Jesus Christ in all constructive thought on human problems and of His sufficiency to meet all the yearnings of the human heart.

THE OPEN-MINDEDNESS OF THE CONGRESS

Meeting at such a time, the gathering at Montevideo was marked by rare open-mindedness. The prevailing idea of the nature of the Congress was that it was a meeting organized by the Evangelical group to confer with South America about a re-facing of her great spiritual and social problems in the light of the teachings of Christ.

Said Dr. Robert E. Speer: "We are here to push out the limits of our life and thought. We are not to add anything to Christ and the truth that has come in Him, but we are to make fresh discoveries in this truth and new demands upon this power. Christianity does not flinch from such fresh examinations. The more we subject it to tests of life and the world, the more we discover that what is needed is there. . . . We are here in this Congress to discover how rich and varied the Christian gospel is."

Authority was never more challenged than at Montevideo. The desire to hear the views of those who differed from the majority was continually expressed. Men and women who were not members of Evangelical churches, not participators in the general sentiment of the delegations, and who did not understand a good deal of what the Congress represented, were entirely free to express themselves and to attend or not to attend the vari-

ous sessions, as they desired. They were quite unaccustomed to such liberty. Neither governments nor churches in South America usually grant such liberty. The fact that it was granted so freely in a religious assembly largely dominated by Protestants and including many foreigners was particularly appreciated by liberal South Americans.

A wide divergence of opinion existed concerning the advisability of inviting those outside of Evangelical circles who might bring to the delegates the thoughts of the great leaders in South American social movements. A favorable decision was made, however, and the leaders invited were frank in their expressions of opinion.[1] It looked at times as though this freedom of speech could not but disrupt the assembly, but no revolt took place. Liberty of expression was carried through to a successful end.

The Brazilian Government sent officially, with a special diplomatic passport, its distinguished head of the Department of Indian Affairs, Dr. Luis B. Horta de Barbosa, with a commission to secure from the Congress data on the Indians of the continent. The Government of Chile commissioned Professor Salas Marchant to secure data on education. Professor Ernesto Nelson of Argentina and President Enrique Molina of Chile were also given official leave to go to Montevideo.

The Latin American representative of the League of Nations, the Minister of Education of the Uruguayan Government, various ministers from different foreign countries, distinguished statesmen and educators, came to visit the Congress and to express sympathy with its work.

[1] Some of the most striking opinions expressed will be found in Chapter III of this book.

When, during the last few days of the Congress, the people of the city began to realize the character of the gathering, a great change came over their attitude.

The day that statesmen, educators, and leaders in the social movements of South America openly attended and frankly addressed the Montevideo Congress marked a new day for the Evangelical Church of that continent. It opened a new era of tolerance and of appreciation both of the intellectuals for the Church and of the Church for the intellectuals. It announced to the continent, since this was discussed in the press of all the countries, that some of her most distinguished citizens had come to consider seriously the Evangelical movement as a potential force in the life of her people and it announced at the same time that the Evangelical Church now desires to counsel openly and frankly with those in their own lands who are directing the destinies of the people for whom these churches are working. It lifted Protestantism to a place where it is to be regarded as at least a possible ally to all those who fight for larger liberty, morality, social reform, and spiritual culture.

Heretofore, with notable exceptions, the intellectual element in South America has hardly considered Protestantism as worthy of its attention, while, on the other hand, Evangelicals have regarded the intellectuals as hopelessly atheistic and impossible of spiritual understanding. It would be hard to say which group was the more benefited by its contacts at Montevideo. But the good results on both sides are destined to bring much fruit for both parties in the coming years.

Enough has been said to indicate that there were many points of division in the Montevideo Congress and that little effort was made to produce a false appearance of

unity on the surface. Differences between Anglo-Saxons and Latins have already been intimated. There were also profound differences between the South Americans themselves. Brazil, Portuguese-speaking, has half of the territory and half of the population of South America. There have always been some differences between Brazil and Spanish-speaking South America.

This was a particularly critical time between Chile and Peru. Though enemies for half a century, because of the Tacna and Arica question, both these countries had delegates at Montevideo, the first time that such an event had happened in an international conference for a long time. Representatives from Colombia, Venezuela, and Ecuador felt themselves facing problems quite different from those of the southern countries of South America.

Among other differences were those existing between the nationals of South America and the foreigners. Theologically there were, of course, progressives and conservatives. And there were those interested in social movements and those who believed that the Congress should consider only the technical questions centering around evangelism and the building of an indigenous church. The differences between the Young Men's Christian Association and the churches were noticeable because the questionable attitude of the former toward the Evangelical basis had been shown by the decision of the Association to send only fraternal delegates to the Congress.

There was, of course, the difference between Catholics and Protestants. While no official delegates from the Catholic Church were present, members of that church who were interested in the great social movements of the continent had been invited, and they spoke from the plat-

form. Among the Protestant delegates there were many varieties of opinion concerning the attitude that should be taken toward Roman Catholicism. Finally, there were strong denominationalists on the one hand and strong believers in a unified church on the other.

Here, indeed, were all kinds of opportunities for division with none of the devices used by old-time conference leaders to forestall division. Often it looked as though disruption would come. Denominational narrowness killed a number of far-reaching proposals for the Kingdom's business. Yet day by day the Congress grew in unity, and on the final day the findings were unanimously and enthusiastically approved by all.

SELF-DETERMINATION

The whole preparation for and conduct of the Montevideo Congress marked a new recognition of the responsibility of the Evangelical Christians of South America for the evangelizing of the continent. There were most encouraging evidences of their increasing ability to carry their share. As for the Congress itself, the North American committee insisted that its duties were only to gather together a representative delegation and to provide such machinery as would insure the most comfort, the efficient use of time, and the opportunity of expression for each delegate. The conduct of the Congress was left entirely in the hands of its members.

A South American, Professor Erasmo Braga, was elected President of the Congress. Fortunately there was found in this distinguished Brazilian the peer of any presiding officer of an international gathering. Many an experienced chairman would have become flustered in

some of the difficult and delicate situations that arose, but President Braga never lost a clear understanding of the issues involved or the entire control of the assembly. No one was ever allowed to feel that he did not have full chance to express his opinions. Nothing was hurried over when discussion was desired. No resolutions were put over by suppressing discussion or by framing them in such language that they would not be clear. Montevideo Congress may not have been as "efficient" as some other conferences, but its members could certainly feel that the conference was what they themselves made it. On the last great day, when the Congress approved the findings, this was accomplished with a unanimity and heartiness possible only because of the feeling that the conclusions had been reached by the whole assembly and that they had not been imposed by any small group of propagandists or "leaders."

It is interesting to compare the Montevideo Congress with the previous Congress that met in Panama under the auspices of the same Committee on Cooperation in 1916. For the Panama Congress the eight commission reports were prepared by sending questionnaires to Latin America and from the answers to these questionnaires and from original investigations the reports were written in the United States. For Montevideo the commission reports were prepared in South America. Each country made its own studies of the twelve subjects agreed upon. A committee in the United States simply took the reports as prepared in the countries themselves and edited them, joining them together to make an acceptable unit within the space allowed. In Panama the reports were printed only in English. In Montevideo they were printed in Spanish and Portuguese as well.

In Panama the findings were parts of commission reports, prepared beforehand by the Commissions. They were not voted on at the Congress, in order that no one need feel embarrassed by committing himself or his organization to any policy. At Montevideo the request had been made previous to the gathering that definite findings outlining clear programs be made by the gathering itself.

The difference in the use of languages in the two conferences marked also the great emphasis that Montevideo placed on the national element. Spanish was the official language of the Congress. Those speaking Portuguese of course could understand Spanish and vice versa, so that the only ones to lose in comprehending were those to whom English alone was intelligible.

Self-determination was evidenced at Montevideo for three reasons: because of the growth of South America itself; because of the development of the Evangelical Church and the fact that its various branches were learning to work together; and because the foreign element had come to have a new respect for the South Americans. These things, together with the pressing social problems which forced themselves on the Congress, explain to a considerable degree why Panama and Montevideo differed so largely in the consideration of their relations to Roman Catholicism. At Panama this was the most important of all questions. At Montevideo, while there was a whole commission report devoted to its study, it received comparatively little attention in the debates. While at Panama there might have been a question in the minds of some as to the advisability of Protestant missions working in Latin America, at Montevideo, the Evangelical Church felt itself as an established part of the life of South America, an institution which is taken for granted.

With its firmer establishment as a national institution, therefore, the big question at Montevideo had shifted to the Evangelical Church itself, its own pressing problems, those of the community, and what the relationships should be between the South American Church and the foreign missionaries and Boards which had given it birth and fostered its life up to the present.

Be it said to the credit of the foreign element in the Congress, they recognized clearly the changed situation and for the most part joined heartily in working out plans for meeting it. The North American delegates returned home with a new respect and a new admiration for South America, with a new confidence in her ability to produce leadership, and a new belief in the power of the Evangelical Church there.

The Commission appointed to consider the problem of relations between foreign and national workers declared:

> With the vigorous growth of the Evangelical churches in South America in recent years, the growth of an independent spirit among the leaders, and even in the body of the membership, has gone forward more rapidly, perhaps, than has the growth of the national consciousness itself. Wherever and whenever the consciousness of growing material, intellectual, and spiritual resources becomes strong, the desire for independence, sooner or later, appears.

The son of an Argentine minister, who became a university professor, spoke frankly of why more Latin American young men did not enter the ministry. "Not infrequently," he said, "the national evangelist has been treated as an inferior by his foreign colleague. The latter has not always been able to throw off the prejudices of racial, national, and cultural superiority. He has

dubbed the native pastor 'brother,' but, frequently, as the vulgar phrase has it, 'whilst staring over his shoulder.' The foreign evangelist has reserved the best post for himself; has generally stationed himself nearest the center of greatest resources, where life is pleasanter and less exposed to privations; he has, generally speaking, enjoyed a fair salary, while the native 'brother' has little less than begged his bread, and resigned himself to leaving his children practically unschooled."

The whole question of national leadership revolves around the matter of proper education for such leaders. If the Evangelical Church has few leaders equal to some of the great educators in state and private institutions who attended the Congress, it is clearly not because they cannot be produced, but because proper educational facilities have not been provided. Evidently most of the effort of the North American missionaries should now be given, not to doing the work themselves, but to educating South Americans who can render the service needed.

In referring to the need of work among students, the Commission on Unoccupied Fields said:

> The contribution deeply desired, urgently needed, frequently requested, but yet to be made by the Evangelical churches to meet the present situation, is the provision of national ministers of commanding education, specially trained and consecrated for student work. In preparation and in personality such ministers should equal the strongest "student pastors" at university centers in North America. In addition to a broad general culture and a sound theological training, they should be oriented into student problems.

A university professor tells how lack of educated leaders is keeping men out of the church: "The churches laid themselves out to open Evangelical centers in all the

country before a sufficient staff had been developed to direct them. To this must be attributed the stand-off attitude of thousands of men and women, who, as children, went to Sunday schools. When such entered national schools and colleges, that is to say, when they came up against great philosophical and sociological problems, they soon found that their mental position could not be reconciled with the teaching of the pastors, and that these latter could not satisfy their new vision. They parted company. Hence, the present congregations which constitute the Evangelical churches are, in a great majority of cases, uneducated and lacking in social importance."

DE-ANGLICIZING MISSIONARY METHODS

The closer association of all Evangelical work with life in South America, rather than following the Anglo-Saxon type, was often recognized. For instance, the educational findings declare:

> We recognize the great educational advance of recent years all over South America, and yield ungrudging admiration for the administrative, pedagogical, and material efficiency of various national school systems. We realize that it behooves our Evangelical educational institutions to give convincing proofs of their loyal cooperation in the educational program of their respective countries. We therefore recommend that each institution study in what ways, if any, it can still further approximate the government system of teaching and national ideas in education, or make a contribution thereto, consistently with its fundamental aims.

Adjusting Evangelical propaganda to Latin psychology would mean a larger emphasis on personality than on organization. Organization to the Saxon is one of those indispensable matters in life without which he cannot exist.

The story is told of a well-known English lecturer who avowed that "wherever there are found together two or three Americans, there will they organize and elect a chairman, secretary, and sub-committee." But two or three Latins or many times that number may be together for many moons without ever thinking of organization. The strongest characteristic of the Hispanic American is individualism. This he has inherited from his American and his Iberian-Arabic ancestry. His relationships are personal. The strength of any leader, political or otherwise, in Hispanic America, is his personal relations. Candidates for office win, not by strong platforms, but by strong friendships. Business is captured, not by strong organization which is able to undersell and hurry up deliveries, but by personal relationships with the buyer. Letters of introduction, which have largely gone out of style with the Anglo-Saxon, are still much in vogue among Latins.

In spite of this well-recognized psychology of the Latin American, the North American missionary in southern countries generally follows his own mental bent. The first thing he is likely to do on taking up his residence in a Latin country is to set up a foreign organization.

Too often foreign workers give all their time to the classroom, the office, or to meetings, so that none is left for personal friendships, except with those who are of their own circle and those whom they hope to secure as members of their organization. There are thousands of forward-looking men in South America who are anxious for fellowship with people who know the outside world. Time spent with such men would often redound to the great good of the people whom the missionary has gone to serve. Many might never become members of the mis-

sionaries' organizations, but some would, and all would contribute to the missionaries' life-purpose.

Several experiments have been tried recently in which missionary work is carried on in a way that will go along with the current of custom and that will not set up unnecessarily difficult barriers immediately on the establishment of work, and these are giving most interesting results. The Scotch Mission in Lima, instead of starting, as was the custom, with small preaching services, began with a small day-school, which has been built up until it now carries a secondary course and fits young men for the National University. The whole work of the mission has been limited so far to the building up of that school. And they have not started evangelistic work, one asks? Perhaps not, according to our rigid Anglo-Saxon method of thinking, in which evangelistic work must mean a meeting-house and all its accompaniments. But no one can go into the dormitory where the boys of the school are boarded and into the classes where they are taught without realizing how far-reaching is the evangelistic work that is being done among them.

It was significant that the Montevideo Congress voted to endorse the "Conferencia sin culto"; that is, the public presentation of the Christian message, under certain conditions, without the accompanying Protestant ritual of Bible reading, singing, and prayer. Some may regard it as "selling out" not to put the Protestant mark on all that one does and all that one publishes, and to fail to announce in every company to what organization one belongs. But to do so often keeps perfectly good people who are honestly interested in the truth from examining one's presentation of it.

South America is open to the message of Christ. But

she does not like the purely Anglo-Saxon method of presenting that message, nor does she like much emphasis on dogma. Said a very fine Chilean gentleman recently, when expressing his inability to join a Protestant Church, "I will do anything for Christ, but nothing for controversy." Whether we like it or not, it is very evident that without more than a preaching program we may be in cities like Buenos Aires, Havana, Lima, and Santiago the rest of the age, and still the people will be ignorant of or indifferent to our presence.

A professor in the Normal School in Peru said: "The kind of religion we would accept would be one that emphasized beauty, love, and service—one that takes you away from fear. I left the Catholic Church because they were always talking about the *infierno*. Perhaps it will be as horrible as they say, but I propose to have at least a little respite from it. We want something encouraging, not an everlasting threat. Teach us a religion that exalts life and service, and we will accept it."

The Congress showed a deep sympathy with expressions of this kind. One of the members of a Commission went so far as to suggest "the *creation of groups of religious fraternities* less restricted than churches, permitting the admission of such Catholics as may wish to deepen their religious life among likeminded people, yet in a form not incompatible with their own Church loyalty. These groups should also have room for those who have sympathy with Christian ideals, but who are not ready to ally themselves to any of the existing churches."

The findings of the Congress recommended:

"In view of the fact that there exist in all large centers groups of people belonging especially to the educated classes who, while being sincere Christians or being in-

terested in Christianity in a general way, are not disposed to associate themselves with any of the existing churches, we recommend that specially prepared men be set apart to work with these groups with a view to leading them to a full experience of Christ, and by gradual and natural stages lead them to a full outward expression of their faith."

FOR FURTHER READING

The books named below contain material on subjects discussed in other chapters of this book and are recommended as a valuable selected library for any group or individual.

Christian Work in South America. Reports of Commissions on Unoccupied Fields, Indians, Education, Evangelism, Social Movements, Health Ministry, Church in the Community, Religious Education, Literature, Relations between Foreign and National Workers, Special Religious Problems, Cooperation and Unity. Revell Co., New York. 1925.

Latin America. W. R. Shepherd. Holt & Co., New York. 1914.

Latin America and the United States. Graham H. Stewart. Century Co., New York.

Latin America, Its Rise and Progress. F. García Calderón. Scribner's Sons, New York. 1918.

Makers of South America. Margarette Daniels. Missionary Education Movement, New York.

New Days in Latin America. Webster E. Browning. Missionary Education Movement, New York. 1925.

Problems in Pan Americanism. S. G. Inman. Doran Co., New York. 1925.

South of Panama. E. A. Ross. Century Co., New York. 1915.

Most important for fresh information not found in books are the files of the last two years of the following magazines, which should be consulted without fail:

Bulletin of the Pan-American Union. Washington, D. C.

Current History Magazine of the New York Times. New York.

Inter-America. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York.

Missionary Review of the World. 156 Fifth Avenue, New York.

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

Chapter II

1. What are your impressions concerning the strength or weakness of Evangelical work in Latin America?
2. How far is the success of mission work dependent on unity of program among the various denominational agencies?
3. Is there any just reason for South Americans to believe that there is any connection between the movement from North America for spiritual penetration and the one for economic penetration?
4. How does the appeal of Protestant missions in South America compare with the same in other parts of the world?
5. What do you consider to be the most important lines for the present development of Evangelical work in South America?
6. Are there any reasons why the Christian message in Latin America should be any more or any less social in character than in the United States?
7. Is it proper for missionary forces to develop cooperative relations with governments in social work; with such groups as laborers, students, and women's clubs? What practical results might be expected from such relations?
8. Would it be wise to appoint a North American Social Service Secretary and a Public Health expert for South America; if so, what should be their main work?
9. How far should the North American missionary seek to secure the adoption in South America of his country's program of prohibition and other social reforms?
10. After a study of the program called for by the findings of the Congress, which of its features seem to be most important for North Americans to foster?
11. Would mission boards be justified in reducing expenditures on their own denominational program in order to share in the interdenominational program projected at Montevideo?

II

SOME FRUITS OF THE VENTURE

Latin America is the only part of the world where a continent-and-a-half speaks practically the same language and has, essentially, the same problems and ideals. It is inspiring to plan a united program for a whole country. But to serve unitedly one of the great sections of the world, embracing twenty republics, is a far more challenging task.

The Montevideo Congress had as its basis eight years' experience of organized cooperation, as the Commission on Cooperation and Unity pointed out:

> The recent rapid development of the influence of Evangelical forces in Latin America owes much to the new spirit of unity which is impressing the people in general. The city of Rio de Janeiro is one of the largest centers of the Protestant Church in the Latin world. The combined offices of the Committee on Cooperation in Brazil, of the Brazilian Sunday School Association, of the American Bible Society, and of the National Committee of the Young Men's Christian Association occupy two whole floors of a downtown office building in Rio de Janeiro. In Santiago, Chile, there are now some sixty foreign workers. Missionaries are called to teach in the university, to serve on examining boards of state schools, and to occupy prominent places in social movements. In Buenos Aires the Young Men's Christian Association has on its staff some of the best-known leaders in social reform in Argentina. *Colegio Americano,* supported by the Methodist Church and the Church of the Disciples, is securing the attention of state educators, even in that metropolitan center. Montevideo boasts of the finest Evangelical church building for Spanish-speaking peoples in the world. In Montevideo and São Paulo the Evangelicals have the two best-

equipped girls' schools in South America. In Lima, Peru, a missionary has been elected a regular member of the faculty of the exclusive University of San Marcos. In the city of Mexico an audience of a thousand often gathers on Sunday evening in one of the churches. This same church has a Sunday school of some six hundred members. In Porto Rico the Evangelical Church is recognized as the most aggressive force for social reform.

Organizers of the Panama Congress and workers on the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America may well take courage at the part this movement has had in bringing the Evangelical work to its present strength. The difference between the impact of the Evangelical work in the community in 1916 and at present is truly remarkable. It has been brought about by a united study of the task, a united program of action, the presentation of a united front before the community, and a broader, more positive, more comprehensive, conception of the service to be rendered.

SOCIAL MINDEDNESS

The discussion of practically every major topic at Montevideo was approached from the point of view of the new social awakening in South America. In contrast to the Panama Congress the Montevideo gathering had three commissions appointed to study especially these questions; namely, "Social Movements," "Health Ministry," and "The Church in the Community." These reports represented a new interest in social questions by the Evangelical Church of South America.

But the Congress was very sure of the social implications of the gospel. It was the Commission on Evangelism that raised the following questions:

Has organized Evangelical Christianity in South America anything to say to the working-man as to his relationships with his employer? Has it any message to the employer regarding his

relationships with his working-men? Has it anything to say regarding the profits which a man may legitimately take from his business? Has the Church any message as to the right of the laboring classes to a larger share of the fruits of production? Has it anything to say as to the number of days a man shall work in a week, or the number of hours during which he shall work within a given day? Shall the Church have anything to say as to the age at which children may be taken from their homes and thrust into the industrial world? Has Evangelical Christianity anything to say about the peon system in vogue in so many Latin American countries? Has it anything to say as to the exploitation of the natural resources of the land by a favored few, while the great majority of the people live in misery? Has it anything to say as to the housing conditions in our great cities and in our country places? Has organized Evangelical Christianity any word regarding the health and general sanitation of our cities and country?

Throughout practically the whole history of the organized labor movement its adherents have seemed to think that the Church is a capitalistic organization. Has Evangelical Christianity in Latin America done anything to disprove this statement? Have its leaders shown themselves in any special way to be the friends of the exploited groups in the national life? Has Evangelical Christianity any word to say as to the militaristic policy of the land in which it is working? Have the churches any distinct mission of peace and international good-will?

Dr. Ernesto Nelson, of Buenos Aires, frankly told the Congress that the future of the Evangelical Church in South America depended largely on its interest in the social problems that are stirring the continent. He said:

"Let me reveal to you a secret, which is that there is an extended idea in these countries that there is a bond of union between the movements of spiritual penetration and the great commercial and industrial organizations of the United States. It is supposed that by gaining the

children in the early years of their life and impressing them favorably toward North American institutions, these impressions will remain for all time, and aside from these impressions being Christian, they will also be favorable toward commercial penetration. These ideas may be entirely erroneous, but in order that Christianity may be rightly interpreted and these suspicions allayed, there must be no question about your sincerity and your love, which must be shown by your interest in our social problems.

"I am sorry to say that in the numerous congresses on social problems which have been recently held there has been little evidence of the interest of North Americans in these social questions. Nevertheless, there is an enormous work for you to do because of your larger experience in these matters. It is sometimes true that these countries have an almost perfect social legislation but the laws are not carried out in practise. This is largely due to the fact that there are no trained men and women who are both capable and willing to make necessary sacrifices for the enforcement of such laws. I am sure that one of the factors which has kept down suspicion concerning the Young Men's Christian Association has been its willingness to help in our social problems. Thus the 'House of the Child' in Buenos Aires, a work carried on by a group of members of the Young Men's Christian Association, has greatly contributed to a demonstration of the good-will of the Association toward Argentina. Also, the willingness of the secretaries of the Association to contribute to the physical education and development of national institutions has been a further demonstration of this interest.

"There is a wonderful opportunity for the Evangelical

forces to show an interest in physical education in such organizations as orphanages, reformatories, and prisons. Praise should be given to the Methodist orphanage of Mercedes which has been the only Evangelical organization which was ready to seize the opportunity for cooperation with the government in the caring for delinquents when the new law concerning minors was passed."

The serious way in which the Congress accepted the duty of the Church toward Christianizing the social order in South America is clearly seen in the following findings, which, if carried out, would revolutionize the Church's program and influence.

Inasmuch as the so-called "individual" and "social" gospels constitute two essential and complementary aspects of the gospel of Christ, we consider that no Christian Church fully discharges its mission unless it ministers to human welfare in both a physical and a spiritual sense.

The Congress would express its deep interest in all movements tending toward the application of the principles of Christ for the improvement of the physical, mental, moral, and social habits and standards of the members of the community and their environmental conditions and influences. There are many such movements seeking to raise the level of individual and community life.

Recognizing the importance of cooperation with the government forces and with other institutions in a study and solution of such social problems as child welfare, personal and domestic hygiene, public health, housing, wholesome recreation, civic responsibility, alcohol, gambling, prostitution, illiteracy, etc., it is recommended:

That each church make a study of its district and the conditions therein existing.

That existing theological and moral schools add to their present curricula courses for the training of leaders for social work.

That each of the Regional Committees appoint a sub-committee on Social Service for the study of its field and to outline a program of action.

That the Committee on Cooperation in New York provide in its budget, when possible, for the selection and support of a competent specialist for the work of this continent, including office and traveling expenses.

It is recommended that the churches give special attention to cooperation with local movements for temperance, furnishing leaders so far as possible where they are lacking; that at least an annual sermon on temperance be preached in every church, and that pastors urge church members to become total abstainers.

Since Christ Himself made no unequal distinctions between men and women, the Evangelical forces should educate public opinion to stand squarely for equal rights and duties of men and women before the law, and for an equal standard of morality in its highest interpretation.

One of the chief difficulties in the way of aggressive Christian effort in South American countries is the absence of Christian public opinion. In view of the fact that the mind of Christ cannot be realized on moral, social, and economic questions without the cooperation of a healthy public opinion, we urge the churches to take all possible steps to foster the growth of such opinion.

In order to stimulate and guide interest in the social aspects of Christianity, Mission Boards would do well to express themselves on this subject to their representatives on the field.

We recognize the importance of agricultural missions as a form of community service and recommend that such missions should, either through direct effort or by means of organized agricultural societies, promote community life by holding annual fairs which should represent the interests of the whole community.

In order that pastors may be in a position to give the necessary leadership in community enterprises, we recommend that courses in social science form part of the curriculum of all theological seminaries.

While recognizing the existence in some cities of good hospitals, well-trained physicians, and modern clinical facilities, we recognize the need of providing such health service in rural and other districts. Christ healed, taught, and preached. Can we afford to omit one of the means which He used? Why should

medical work be established in South America? Because tens of thousands of lepers on this continent challenge Christianity; because huge tracts in some Republics are without a medical man; because many towns have no medical attendance; or, at best, the visit of a physician once or twice a year; because in a city of approximately a million inhabitants there is no children's hospital or special care for tubercular patients; because in at least one country six out of ten children die before reaching the age of two years.

In order to help to remedy these conditions, it is recommended that there should be put into the field, under interdenominational auspices, a highly-trained medical and health specialist to make a thorough study of medical and health conditions on the South American continent; to formulate a far-seeing, comprehensive policy of health education; to serve as expert adviser on these matters to the Church Boards; to co-operate with the national health forces.

We rejoice in the growing social idealism of the University students of South America and in the devotion they have shown in the practical application of their ideals, and we recommend that the churches take steps to establish closer working relationships with them in the solving of the social problems of the continent.

Among the most notable of all the declarations of the Congress was the following resolution unanimously adopted:

We recommend to all the Christian forces which are at work on the American continent that they make a study of the causes and cure of war, and that they both work and pray unceasingly that the spirit of peace and the practise of justice may eliminate from the world, once and for all, the terrible curse of war.

Christ calls us to universal brotherhood. Peace in industry and among the nations, economic security for all, the elevation of the classes without opportunities, the development of backward races, the enrichment of all peoples by the free interchange of scientific and spiritual discoveries, the complete realization of

our highest human possibilities—all await the recognition and practise of universal brotherhood. We therefore call upon all Christian forces to purge their hearts of all suspicion, prejudice, and selfishness; to begin now to treat all men as brothers; to foster the spirit of good-will in schools and churches by voice and by pen; to challenge all sources of discord between national and international groups; to establish such personal contacts with men of different faiths and social status and national affiliations as shall become a leaven of brotherhood all over the continent; to study sympathetically the activities of men and women in other lands in order that knowledge may banish suspicion; to become leaders at home in the development of a conscience whose touchstone is the Golden Rule of Christ.

OPPORTUNITY

The Congress met in a spirit of optimism concerning the great future of South America, the new spiritual awakening on the Continent and the opportunities offered to the Evangelical Church in serving the people. The findings declared:

South America holds a large and rapidly growing place in the life of the world. Capital and people are pouring in from the older and overcrowded countries to develop its immense natural resources and occupy its fertile plains. There exist here all the conditions that make for great movements and great consequences to humanity. The wisest development, therefore, of the political, economic, and social life of the continent, as well as its impact on the world, makes it imperative that South America shall be enabled to have the highest spiritual development. The great problem of both continents, north and south, is a religious problem. While on the one hand the masses have inadequate opportunity to rise out of their deep economic, intellectual, and spiritual poverty, the directing classes remain largely indifferent to religion as a vital factor in human progress.

The peoples of South and North America absolutely require the

ministry which Christianity has to offer, and the ever-growing place of these countries in the life of the world makes it imperative that they be adequately furnished with the forces that make for the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth.

In regard to the status of the Evangelical Church in South America, the Congress was told by the Commission on Unoccupied Fields that while the past eight years can record for the continent no spectacular accretions to the churches, there are evidences that Divine favor has blessed the work with a steady growth. In influence and range of service, and in some respects numerically, the advance made in the republics since 1916 has been greater than that of the entire preceding period from 1855, when the Protestant enterprise was first permanently planted in Brazil.

The number of organized churches in the continent has grown from 856 to 1,283, an increase of 50 per cent. The communicant membership has added 29,029, which is almost one fourth of the present total membership (122,266), and a 31 per cent increment over the membership of 1916 (93,237).

The total Evangelical community has more than doubled. It has grown from 122,875 to 251,196, an increase of 128,321. The number of Sunday-school pupils and teachers has increased from 50,739 to 108,599, a gain of over 100 per cent.

To the staff of national Christian workers 662 have been added. From 1,342 it has grown to 2,004, a gain of slightly over 50 per cent. During the eight years 529 new foreign missionaries have entered the continent—approximately 30 per cent of the present total number of workers from abroad (1,736).

The number of out-stations and other places exclusive of residence stations, where worship and preaching are conducted, has grown by 1,296, from 895 to 2,191, a gain of over 140 per cent. The Evangelical centers or resident stations have increased by 98, from 267 to 365, a gain of 37 per cent.

The largest numerical advance, both actual and proportionate, has been made in Brazil; Argentina and Chile follow next in order. In Brazil the total Evangelical community has more than doubled, the communicant church membership has increased more than one third, the number of organized churches more than one half, the national workers have grown nearly 100 per cent, the ordained Brazilian ministers 33 per cent. Forty-five new central or residence stations have been established. Other places of preaching and worship have grown from 364 to 1,765, an almost five-fold gain.

A continent within a continent

That an immense interior territory of solid extent, embracing the hinterlands of many countries, lies almost wholly outside the present spheres of Evangelical activity, has long been known in a general way. The mere tracing of its boundaries should suffice to indicate how colossal is the unaccomplished task of penetrating the whole continent with the gospel of Christ.

The configuration of the area in question would, with comparatively slight irregularities, resemble that of South America itself. It is indeed a continent within a continent. The northern curve of a line enclosing it, beginning at the Equator on the Andean plateau, would include (1) Ecuador above Quito, from the central mountains to the Colombian divide; (2) all of Colombia, south of Cali and Bogotá and east of the Cordillera Oriental, with an upward dip into the Cordillera Central, and the Cauca Valley to the border of Antiochia; (3) Venezuela, south of the Caribbean States, about nine tenths of the whole republic; (4) British and Dutch Guiana, except a coast strip of about forty miles; (5) all of French Guiana. Continuing eastward and southward the curve would embrace (6) all of Brazil, except maritime sections of the northern states from Para to Rio Grande do Norte, the eastern and southern coast states from Parahyba to central Bahia, and from the lower two thirds of Minas Geraes to Rio Grande do Sul; (7) all of Uruguay, except its southern departments and a short fringe of territory along its western river; (8) the interfluvial Argentine region west of the Uruguay River; (9) large sections of central and western Argentina, from the Bolivian Chaco to the Territory of the Pampas,

and almost the whole of the Patagonian peninsula from Rio Negro to the Strait of Magellan. Turning northward on the western side, the line would enclose roughly (10) the eastern half of Chile, with several curves west of the Andes; (11) the eastern half and the northern departments of Peru, with immense loops to the Pacific Coast in the central and southern zones; (12) and, finally, the southern half and eastern two thirds of Ecuador, in addition to the section above the Equator; (13) Bolivia, and (14) Paraguay, being inland republics, are necessarily included within the border drawn.

The "continent within a continent" equals more than a third of all Asia, more than a half of all Africa. It constitutes for Evangelical Christianity from the territorial viewpoint, not only the premier field in South America, but the largest geographical expanse of unworked territory to be found on the face of the earth.

In the presentation to the Congress of this report, Mr. Charles J. Ewald, Secretary of the Continental Committee of the Young Men's Christian Association, said:

The report shows:

1. That it is the right and the duty of the Evangelical forces to be in South America. The facts set forth make this unmistakably clear. The great problem of South America is the need of a vital, living religion emphasizing duty, morality, and service. Such a religion is needed:

a) That a true democracy based on moral culture may be developed.

b) That the masses may be helped to rise out of their deep economic, moral, and spiritual poverty to share in the blessings which God intends for all.

c) That the directing classes may be increasingly conscious of their responsibility to the people whose destinies they shape.

d) That the people individually and collectively may be helped to attain the full meaning of Christianity, both for their own sakes and because of the increasing importance of South America in the modern world.

2. That the new conditions which now obtain in South America encourage everyone to hopefulness. In recent years crises are constantly taking place which have much significance.

a) There are notable efforts being put forth to obtain a truer democracy.

b) There is a social awakening especially among industrialists, whose leaders while largely unfriendly to religion are so because they fail to understand it. They need to be shown that true religion is their ally in all just aspirations and that the masses have not only rights but duties.

c) There has been an ethical revival. Movements have developed among various classes.

d) At the other extreme of society is the younger intellectual group with an idealism which seeks new leadership. Many evidences of this attitude may be stated:

(1) A demand for greater sincerity and reality in their intellectual guide.

(2) A demand for social justice for all groups of society.

(3) A growing sympathy and cooperation between the younger intellectuals and the working classes.

(4) A demand for international righteousness and for means other than war for settling differences between nations.

(5) A new interest in social questions, such as child welfare, public health, or physical education.

(6) A readiness shown by university students to teach and assist members of the working class.

(7) A new appreciation of moral and spiritual values.

(8) A new sense of responsibility on the part of the leaders.

(9) A spirit of service and sacrifice for the general welfare.

(10) A wholly new interest in religion among students and the younger intellectuals.

3. That the Evangelical forces are inadequate to the greatness and urgency of this task so that the following program is distinctly demanded:

a) A fresh effort by the Evangelical forces to present Christ and His program to the great government student groups. This work has largely been assigned to the Associations, but the churches should be closely linked to these groups.

(1) In the long run they are the ones who will lead popular

activities. They are also those who virtually determine the attitude of the people toward religion.

(2) They are a great present force in the making of public opinion.

(3) They are the class which is most open to idealistic appeals today and most ready to listen to Evangelical truth.

(4) They are very accessible when properly approached. On the entire continent there is only a total of 50,000 grouped in forty centers.

(5) No Evangelical church today is making a serious effort to influence this group.

b) A special effort to influence the cultured, directing classes generally. Today this group is but slightly influenced by Evangelical effort. What communion can we name which makes an adequate effort to reach them? In this type of evangelistic work, just as in educational work, our aim must be the spiritual service of the people and not the mere building up of churches or church institutions. The results gained in this special type of work cannot for a long while be measured by church statistics.

c) The educational institutions of primary and secondary grade should be increased in number and quality. In addition to their direct educational service, these institutions are invaluable for the breaking down of prejudice and for creating respect for the Evangelical cause.

d) Much larger responsibility must be given as rapidly as possible to the nationals. There have been great recent gains. Leaders have arisen who share in our responsibility.

e) Our Evangelical churches must be less concerned with institutional growth and more concerned with the Christian message if they would serve well the present hour. May we not trust that God will lead His people into the creation of the needed institutions for their development?

f) The quality rather than the quantity of our work should be emphasized.

g) During the next two or three years there should be a great united effort through lectures, publications, social service, and personal interviews to bring the Christian message to all classes of society. If one single committee could properly organize three hundred earnest Evangelicals for this task and use them for five

years, more would be achieved than during twenty-five years of current procedure, and more than has ever been accomplished up to date.

h) We should recognize the evil of our present denominational division among a people to whom denominational traditions are meaningless and bewildering. We should also make a sincere and earnest effort to give to each South American country one united Evangelical Church.

This cooperative Christian service for a whole continent was set forward a long way by the Congress at Montevideo. The findings call for the following practical demonstrations of unity, which are to be carried out largely by the General Committee on Cooperation in Latin America and the regional cooperative committees:

COOPERATIVE UNDERTAKINGS REQUESTED BY THE MONTEVIDEO CONGRESS

Personnel

1. A specialist in social service for South America
2. A specialist in public health in South America
3. A publication agent for South America
4. A secretary for cooperation for Spanish-speaking South America
5. Secretaries for certain regional committees of cooperation
6. Apologetic lecturers
7. Workers among students in university centers and among special groups of educated people, supported cooperatively
8. Workers among Indians supported cooperatively

Enterprises

1. A continental evangelistic campaign
2. A continental survey of religious education and the development of an indigenous curriculum for South American Sun-

day schools, with literature produced through the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America

3. A Latin American conference of Evangelical publishers and editors
4. Apologetic lecturers both by nationals and foreigners
5. Cooperative community surveys
6. United continental program for public health
7. A union hymn-book in Spanish and one in Portuguese
8. Literature on Social Service
9. More cooperative publication centers and union papers
10. Prizes for literary production
11. Union work among Indians
12. Union international theological schools, with schools of social sciences and languages
13. Union agricultural schools
14. Federation of young people's societies
15. United prayer league
16. Common name "Evangelical" for churches, with denominational name in parenthesis when necessary
17. Special studies requested for the following subjects:
    - Immigration
    - Social and economic movements
    - Cause and Cure of war
    - Assembling of data on religious education in the home
    - Data referring to condition and amount of business of Evangelical bookstores
18. Conferences—regular annual meetings for:
    - General workers
    - Educationists
    - Religious Education workers
    - Purchase of permanent grounds for conferences
19. General committees for South America that will need coordination through a general agency:
    - A continental committee on evangelism
    - A continental committee on social service
    - A continental committee on curriculum of religious education
    - A federation of national churches recommended wherever possible

Thus the outstanding accomplishment of the Montevideo Congress was the development of the feeling of solidarity among the Evangelical churches in South America, which, reaching beyond national and denominational boundaries, unanimously outlined a cooperative program that would challenge a continent to accept the teachings of Jesus. Will mission boards do their part in carrying out this tremendously challenging program?

If sufficient men and money were found to carry out this great program, would it not have a larger effect in South America in the next few years than would twenty times as much expenditure in denominational enterprises? The great doors open to the Evangelical Church by the marked social awakening of South America present the most remarkable opportunity a church has ever confronted in that continent. But this opportunity is presented to the Evangelical Church working as a unit. Individual denominations acting separately in their own name will find it impossible to meet the demands or satisfy the desire of this wonderfully awakened people.

During the Congress there was hung behind the speaker's desk a map of South America. During the first days of the gathering, as one looked at the map there seemed to be quite a clear line of division between the various nations. The great river systems, the high mountains, and the rich plains of South America stood out prominently. As the days proceeded, the map seemed to change, the physical features lost their prominence, and one began to see a great procession of human beings moving up and down the continent. As the dividing lines between Argentina and Brazil, Chile and Peru and the other nations melted away, there pressed upon one's vision the fifty millions of peons, the ten millions of Indians,

seventy-five thousand university students, the great number of teachers and merchants, the growing middle classes, the skilled artisans and the laborers in factories and mines—all of these moved up and down the map. The workmen in their newly organized labor movements, the women in their newly developed feminist movement, the students with their new social-mindedness, the workers for temperance reform, for social justice, and for a new expression of democracy, day by day these came closer to our vision. Finally, on the last great day, when the Spirit had fused us all into one united body, the countless multitudes on the map seemed to change into one composite face—the face of the Christ. It was He dwelling in the souls of these multitudes that was calling to the delegates of the Congress to minister to South America—to minister, not in any patronizing spirit or self-centered egotism or pharisaical self-laudation, but with the simple desire of doing good as Jesus of Nazareth went about doing good.

FOR FURTHER READING

Cooperative Technique for Conflict, A. The Inquiry, New York. 1925.

Whither Bound in Missions. D. J. Fleming. Association Press. New York. 1925.

For further references, see books listed at the end of Chapter I.

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

Chapter III

1. Do frank discussions concerning delicate and profound international, social, and religious questions, coupled with keen criticism, do more good than harm?
2. Should North Americans seek to suppress criticism of their country or should they welcome it?
3. Do North American missionaries in Latin America strengthen the commercial and financial influence of their country in South America? If so, is that to be desired?
4. Is the United States making a deliberate attempt to direct the policies of Latin America and draw it away from Europe? If so, is such a policy right?
5. Is it possible for "the Protestants of the North and the Catholics of the South" to work together against materialism which threatens all America?
6. Does religion occupy the same place in North and South American life?
7. What is the status of Pan-Americanism today?
8. Should the United States favor or oppose an American League of Nations?
9. Are the questions raised by the Latin Americans in the opening of the Montevideo Congress vital to the North American missionary program?

III

THE NIGHT OF THE OPEN HEART

It was the "Night of the Open Heart" [1] in the cultured and cosmopolitan city of Montevideo. In the assembly hall of the Hotel Pocitos, situated by the side of the sea and removed from the traffic of the city, there were gathered the representatives of eighteen nations—South Americans, North Americans, and Europeans, Protestants and Catholics, nationals and foreigners, Anglo-Saxons and Latins. With all of our differences in history, in environment, in psychology, in ideals, we were all there on a great venture in international friendship. Such a conglomerate representation of different nations, different schools of thought, and different theologies may have met before on the American continent but certainly none had ever met with such a full determination of making the great venture of the "Open Heart."

With fear and trembling, with anticipation and with a certain joy, the meeting of the "Open Heart" was called to order. At the invitation of the North Americans the program had been prepared by a half dozen of the South Americans, who took part in the meeting. Two of these were not in any way connected with the North American missionary enterprise. The others were not dependent financially or otherwise on North American organization, neither were they members of a Protestant church.

The presiding officer was Professor Erasmo Braga

[1] The Montevideo Congress opened on Sunday, March 29, 1925, and the Monday evening following was set aside as the "Night of the Open Heart." At this meeting a number of South American leaders were invited to speak to the Congress freely and frankly of what was in their hearts to say to North Americans.

of Brazil. On the morning of the first day of organized meeting, Professor Braga had been elected President of the Congress on Christian Work in South America. He is a fine type of Brazilian gentleman, representative of the very best in the Protestantism of South America. He stands high in his own country, being a member of the Brazilian Academy of Letters, an author of note. For many years he was professor of modern languages in one of the secondary institutions of the State of São Paulo. While holding this position, he contributed, voluntarily, his services as professor in the theological seminary of the Presbyterian churches. Some five years ago he was called to be the Secretary of the Committee on Cooperation in Brazil, which represents all the Evangelical forces in that country. At the Panama Congress in 1916, when the Evangelical forces met for the first time to consider the social, educational, and religious problems of Latin America, Professor Braga was asked to write a volume describing this movement. That volume he called *Pan-Americanism: Its Religious Aspects.*

On opening this remarkable meeting, Professor Braga declared that if he were going to write such a book again, he would not use that title. "Pan-Americanism," he said, "is a depreciated term. It has lost any spiritual significance it may have had and has come to signify only commercial relations. It is most unfortunate that the representatives of the United States have generally referred to Pan-Americanism only as important because of commercial relations and have therefore gradually eliminated the cultural and spiritual aspects of the subject. This has meant that the word has come to signify the commercial dominance of our countries by the United States."

The following are further résumés of sentiments ex-

pressed to the Congress in the same frank way.[1] Professor Braga was followed by Dr. Ernesto Nelson, a graduate of Columbia University, New York, an Argentine educator who has filled many high positions in his own country. He has published a number of books on North American and South American educational problems. Social questions are of particular interest to him, and he is now giving part of his time to various activities of that nature under the auspices of the Young Men's Christian Association in Buenos Aires. He has frequently been introduced as "the leading educator of South America."

The following paragraphs are quoted from Professor Nelson's speech:

"Every traveler who goes from North America to South America, and vice versa, is another Columbus setting out to discover a new world.

"Hitherto Pan-American relations have been centered around commerce. But commerce, being an expression of material interest, cannot very well serve as the vehicle of higher ideals. It is necessary today more than ever before that Pan-Americanism be translated into a more complete understanding of the sources of idealism, of that moral strength with which every American country is gifted; and this is especially true of the United States inasmuch as she is the country in America against which there are most prejudices born of ignorance.

"As to the Latin countries of the continent, they are passing through a period of intense restlessness. Education in all its forms—primary, secondary, university, vo-

[1] Two addresses included in this chapter were delivered on other days, but inasmuch as they are along the same line of thought, they are included here.

cational, and agricultural, the extension of culture by means of libraries and social centers, the associations formed for philanthropic purposes, those institutions which exist for the public good, etc., are today uncertain in regard to the new paths which they ought to follow. The idea of surveys which have acquired such wide acceptance in the United States have not yet been adopted by us.

"It may be said that as yet not even the first step has been taken in the sense of bringing about an interchange of experiences for the solution of identical problems in North and South America.

"The press and the book have not yet begun to carry out an important part of their mission on the continent. It is a shame to confess it, but after so many years of Pan-American theory, there is not today a book of any importance in which some phase of social life in the United States is described in order to serve the readers of Latin America who are interested from a practical point of view in the solution of this or that social problem.

"A constructive Pan-Americanism should create some agencies or means whereby our countries might learn from the experience of each other. Inasmuch as you missionaries are ready to face an enormous expense connected with your work here, I do not see why you could not find the means to carry out this kind of peaceful penetration. The production of such a series of books in Spanish would be a missionary task of the highest character.

"And now, with some misgivings, I want to tell you of a few impressions which may be useful in the development of the Evangelical work in these countries. You come from a land where morality has always been identi-

fied with religion. In these southern lands religion, in the popular mind, is largely identified with immorality. Our people have seen so much immorality connected with the church, with the life of the clergy, in prayer, in the religious attitude toward education, in charity, in the lives of so-called religious people, that I cannot but feel that you are marching under a much discredited banner.

"You come from lands where religious faith may be taken as the mark of Christian character. With us the very opposite is often true. To save itself, morality has had to sever its religious connections and look for the support of science. But in doing this, we eagerly try to discover those scientific principles furthest removed from the supernatural in religion.

"Out of ten thousand leaders in these countries whose help you need, out of ten thousand men and women who have gained moral authority with the people, out of ten thousand educators of the youth of these countries, 9,999 have tried to organize their moral convictions aside from any touch with religious principles, which in their minds are associated with superstition and deception. The process is too far advanced to be stopped. Dr. Mackay told you of the young Peruvian professor to whom the name of God was hateful. The case of the young Peruvian can be duplicated any number of times among the people of these lands. These Latin American societies are mortally sick of performances and beliefs that have been used for tyranny and oppression. They shudder at the word God, they shudder at the sound of religious hymns, they look for the clear sky when they hear the murmur of a prayer.

"But after all, religion is a natural fact. If we could compare the quality of the feelings and motives that

prompt our moral actions, without attempting to dress them with words or to express them through ceremonies, I am sure we could find that we live on common ground.

"Another point to which I should like to refer is the lack of interest that your missionaries generally show in discovering those forces in our life that sustain our moral fabric. I have indicated how far we of the South and of the North seem to be from agreement in religious doctrine. Yet there are many individual Christians among us ready to lead a life of sacrifice for the common good. What is the fountain of their inspiration? You ought to discover it and help them quench their thirst. You should study our great men of the past, for in them you would often find the moral explanation of the meaning of our present institutions. You might be ready to prove that your love for us is sincere by loving the things we love and revering the things we revere. I should like to see as a part of the program of your seminaries and technical schools a course devoted to the study of agencies which have been and are at present the great inspirations of our life. I should like to see the young men studying the ideas of the Chilean, Francisco Bilbao; of the Peruvian, Gonzales Prada; of the Uruguayans, Varela and Rodó; of the Argentines, Sarmiento, Alberdi, or Echeverria. If there is need of an agreement in ideals among us, it cannot be reached without taking into serious consideration the moral ideas of South America, for we have great moral forces on this continent."

The next speaker was Professor Eduardo Monteverde, often called the most beloved man of Montevideo. Don Eduardo is particularly a favorite with the students and all classes of young men. He has been professor of

mathematics in the University for many years. He is in every good work in the city of his nativity. For many years he has given a large part of his time to the Young Men's Christian Association. Unlike Professor Nelson, who since he left the Catholic Church has never identified himself with any religion, Don Eduardo has for many years been a loyal and enthusiastic member of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Professor Monteverde represented his country at the Pan-American Scientific Congress in Washington in 1915, was President of the Congress on Christian Work in Latin America at Panama in 1916, and has occupied some of the highest positions within the gift of his fellow citizens.

"At times we say what we do not think when we are asked to speak," said Professor Monteverde, "but tonight we are to say what we think. I have been a Christian for forty-five years without interruption. I have been a member of the church and the Sunday school and have filled almost every position in each of these organizations. I have watched the work of the churches very carefully during all these years. Many times I have asked myself, 'Where are all these thousands that have been listening to the preaching and to the teaching of the Bible in the Sunday school all these years? Where are the results of the sacrifices of the missionaries that have come from foreign lands?' I have learned in the Sunday school that Christ is power. Here we are in a great congress where representatives of Christ have come from many nations, and yet the press of this city is giving scarcely any attention to this great meeting. What is the difficulty? Have the methods used in the past been mistaken ones? Have our good ministers been bad interpreters of the Christ? How did Christ preach? Did he confuse his pupils with

the doctrine of the Trinity? Did he make them tremble with descriptions of the punishment of hell-fire? Did he spend much time in differentiating between the various denominations and advocating one as against the other?

"The theologians have complicated the teachings of Jesus. In our Sunday schools we ought to concentrate on teaching the life of Christ. We would get many students if we did this. A young boy is induced to come to Sunday school. His father, who knows nothing about the Sunday school and has never read the Bible, asks the boy on his return about what they taught him. The child replies that he was taught about how Jeroboam killed many of his enemies. The father decides that he does not care to have his boy learn about some ancient king killing his enemies. In our Sunday schools we ought to explain Christ. Without Christ there is no Christianity —the Christ of power, the Christ who is here tonight, the Christ I came to know when I became a Christian."

Don Julio Navarro Monzó, a distinguished Argentine, formerly one of the editors of the Buenos Aires daily paper, *La Nacion,* but now a lecturer on spiritual themes under the auspices of the Young Men's Christian Association, spoke on the "Religious Problem as Related to Latin America Culture." He said, in part:

"The essential difference between Anglo-Saxons and Latins is found in the fact that the former carry on continually a struggle between the forces of right and wrong, while for the latter these forces do not exist or are recognized only in a small way. Yet an observer in Great Britain and the United States sees that today the people are losing interest rapidly in traditional forms of Christianity. Recent investigations made in Great Brit-

ain by the National Union of Schools for Adults have demonstrated that only seventeen per cent of the population are found to have effective and permanent relations with the churches. It is possible that the same kind of investigations in the United States would give the same results.

"Seemingly the greatest tragedy of Latin America is its struggle for a century to obtain a real democracy. But in reality the greatest of all tragedies, although less apparent, has been that, confronting such a problem, the leaders of these nations have not had any consciousness of its moral and religious aspects. Men like Alberdi and Sarmiento, great Argentine leaders, believed that all that was necessary was to translate the constitution of the United States from English into Spanish and to study carefully the juridical antecedents of English law. Time has shown how blind they were in this. In the light of history and sociology it is evident that it is not sufficient to copy the institutions and the laws of a people. The Latin Americans would like to have the democracy of the Anglo-Saxons without their historical precedents, without their culture and their emphasis on religion. It is an impossible absurdity!

"The real problem is a religious problem. Without a real and profound Christianity which signifies a fundamental respect for all law, for the rights of individuals, for human fraternity, it is impossible to have a democracy. But this the spiritual leaders of Latin America have never been able to understand.

"Let no one think, however, that this signifies an assertion that the people of Latin America ought to turn Protestant, that is to say, Lutherans, Calvinists, Wesleyans, etc., in order to have democracy. If the Latin

peoples should copy the religious institutions of Anglo-Saxons or Germans developed four centuries ago, they would make as great a mistake as when we copied their political institutions."

The next speaker was Professor Salas Marchan, Director of the Government Normal School at Santiago, Chile, one of those quiet men who, with few pretensions, has gone to the very bottom of the educational problems and stands in his country for the very highest type of education and moral development.

"The greatest help that I ever had in my life as a teacher and as a man was in visiting the schools of the United States," said Professor Marchan. "It is an inspiration that will always be with me, and I know many South Americans who have had this privilege that count it as one of the great transforming experiences of their lives.

"Let me appeal to you tonight to send us the very best teachers that you have. We need your best. Latin America cannot do with any other kind. I want also to appeal for a closer contact between the Evangelical and the Government schools. Your teachers too often stay off by themselves. They are cumbered about with many details. They are busy with their own problems and they do not associate with the teachers in the Government schools. We could help one another a great deal if we would have more contacts. Often I have heard Chilean teachers wonder why the North American teachers that come to our country do not become members of our teachers' associations and take a more active part in our social and professional activities. Let us mingle together more. I am sure that your teachers can help us and you

might find it possible to get help also from us if you would come to know us better."

Sr. Juan Francisco Pérez, the editor of *El Diario,* a daily paper of Asunción, Paraguay, strong friend of the International Institute supported by the Disciples of Christ in Asunción, said:

"On my visit to North America I saw how many religious groups worked together for the moral development of the youth. If North Americans come to help us teach our children and strengthen our moral and spiritual purposes, you will find that Catholics like myself will welcome you; but if you come in the spirit of propaganda, you will scarcely find such a welcome. By working for moral reform, you will awaken the Catholics and do good in many ways. I believe that there should be a federation of all the sects of Christianity in order that the great problems of today may be solved with a Christian spirit."

Don Enrique Molina, Director of the University of Concepción, Chile, is one of those fine personalities that breathes idealism and spiritual acumen. After long service in the capital city of Santiago, with considerable time spent in Europe and the United States, studying educational problems, he decided to make an experiment in Chile which would put to the test private initiative. He founded what is known as the Free University of Concepción in the city of Concepción, about two hundred miles south of Santiago. This institution has grown until it now has some fifteen hundred students and is supported almost entirely by private contributions of Chileans themselves. Professor Molina has studied closely North American educational life and has written

two books as a result—*From Harvard to California* and *The Two Americas*. He is probably further away from anything like orthodox Christian belief than any of the others who spoke on this memorable evening. In the afternoon of this day he had opened a series of addresses under the auspices of the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America at the Ateneo on the subject, "Spiritual Problems of Today." But this evening he was speaking from the profound depths of his heart on the relations between North and South America.

"Pan-Americanism," he said, "is a beautiful ideal. We would not do our duty if we did not seek for closer relations between all the Americas. But unfortunately people today look at Pan-Americanism with skepticism. In its origin it had something of the idea of the hegemony of the United States by means of commercial dominance. The sad history of Haiti, Santo Domingo, Panama, and Nicaragua have augmented the suspicions of the United States' desire to dominate her weaker neighbors. When I returned from the United States, an enthusiastic believer in that country's idealism, and told my people how much we could learn from her, especially concerning moral ideals, honesty of purpose, etc., they suffered through my lectures with an attitude of 'how long must we listen to all this talk about the Yankees?'

"There is a very decided tendency today toward Ibero-Americanism, a getting together of all the Latin American countries. It is particularly strong in Mexico, Argentina, and Chile. In Mexico it has assumed an aggressive form. It is incorporated within the very school system itself and in much of the cultural life of the country during these recent years. The University of Mexico has on its seal a map of that America beginning at the

Rio Grande and stretching south to the Straits of Magellan. And these words are engraved on its seal, 'For my race, my spirit will speak.'

"In Argentina a strong sentiment has been developed during the last few years for this Latin American union. A magazine is published, backed by some of the best-known intellectuals of that country, in order to develop this union. We cannot reject this idea of a Latin American union. Nor can we reject the idea of an all-American cooperation. We must accept both of them. Let us frankly realize, however, that Pan-Americanism and the Monroe Doctrine are opposed to each other. Pan-Americanism means fraternity and equality. The Monroe Doctrine puts the United States above all other countries. This attitude Latin America cannot accept. The Monroe Doctrine has accomplished its mission. It was promulgated in the time of the Holy Alliance when there was some danger that Europe would impose her monarchical system on America. That time has passed. Europe no longer threatens us. Neither Germany nor any other country is now a danger. The Monroe Doctrine is a corpse; let it be forgotten. Pan-Americanism is so far only a hope; let us work for its realization."

Dr. Baltasar Brum is a world citizen. In idealism for world brotherhood and in enthusiasm for international friendship and in advocacy of international organization, he is to South America what Woodrow Wilson was to North America. Not yet forty years of age, he has completed a term as President of his nation. Before being elected to this honor he had won the confidence of his countrymen as a teacher of renown, a lawyer of distinction, a member of the National Assembly, and Minister

of Foreign Relations. When he speaks on international questions, a perfect torrent of eloquence pours forth. He carries everyone with him by his enthusiasm. With his vast knowledge of international affairs, with his penetrating intellect, with his profound conviction of the unity of humanity, he presents his argument and puts forth his proposition with a daring that challenges the admiration of the most ardent isolationist.

Dr. Brum asked: "What has happened in North America, my dear friends? People everywhere are asking me that these days. Are the North Americans idealists or are they materialists? Many believe that Pan-Americanism means to you only commercial relations, but I am convinced that they do not know the United States. Ever since the day that I had the honor of being at the head of the Foreign Relations of my government, I have considered it a privilege to interpret the better side of your country to others.

"I knew that country when she was defending not only her sons and daughters, but ours as well. Such a soul as was displayed in those days is worthy of the friendship of Hispanic America.

"May I dare to say also that the Latin peoples are worthy of the friendship of North America, for we too have often shown ourselves capable of great sacrifices for the principles of right and justice. Why, then, do these two great peoples stand aloof from each other? The fault lies both in the North and in the South. The United States is traditionally opposed to alliances. She believes that standing aloof from the rest of the nations means peace. We in South America believe that the isolation of the United States under present world conditions means war. We in the South believe that all

America ought unitedly to help Europe to new ideals of peace.

"How will world peace be brought about? Only by a society of nations through which the peoples of the world may organize themselves for the pursuit of peace and the adjudication of difficulties and the enforcement of justice. In America we need our own society of nations! Well aware are we of the difficulties in the organization of such a society. Let us remember, however, that in the United States great and small states exist side by side. Rhode Island and Texas have found a way of living together in one great federation. So in South America the great country of Brazil, occupying half of the continent, and the little nation of Uruguay, not one tenth of the size of its big neighbor, live side by side in harmony and mutual help. So the federation of the world must come. A great world league we must have to treat all of the great world questions; then regional leagues that will treat their own problems. Even the United States, which so far has not seen fit to accept a world league, need not fear to join an American League of Nations. The United States, through the Monroe Doctrine, has already obligated itself to defend America from Europe and could not be any more committed if it were to enter into a practical arrangement with the other American states.

"But, says some North American, how can we enter into an agreement with any other nation when our Congress is the only one that can pass on questions of war and peace or questions that limit in any way our sovereignty? Is that true? Is it not a fact that the United States and every other nation that signs a treaty thereby limits to a certain degree its sovereignty and rights? In

any American society it would be stipulated, of course, that only with the approval of the national congresses should anything like war be begun. Someone else objects, 'How is it possible for the United States to unite with little countries like Uruguay and Haiti in a League of Nations?' It is possible by the counterbalance of authority and representation just as this has been accomplished in the great and small states in any federated government.

"There are five great questions which today concern Inter-American relations: Pan-Americanism, the Monroe Doctrine, monetary claims, nationality of children of the foreign-born, and Inter-American conflicts. If the powerful nation of the North decides to carry on a policy of justice and equality with its American sisters, it should be our duty to cooperate with her intentions.

"Pan-Americanism implies the equality of all sovereignties, large or small, the assurance that no country will attempt to diminish the possessions of others, and that those who have lost any possessions will have them rightly returned to them. It is, in short, an exponent of deep brotherly sentiment, and of a just aspiration for the material and moral aggrandizement of all the peoples of America.

"The Monroe Doctrine has constituted on the whole an efficacious safeguard to the territorial integrity of many American countries. Owing to the state in which the European countries remain after the War, it may be said that fear of conquests by them in America has been removed for many years. But, is that sufficient reason for us to take no interest in future Inter-American relations, repudiating all that the Monroe Doctrine legitimately stands for? I think not. Today, more than ever, we

should reveal our foresight, searching for formulæ that may assure forever peace and the full independence of American countries.

"American countries have enjoyed territorial independence but not always an absolute sovereignty, because the larger nations often curtailed it by means of monetary claims in favor of their citizens who, instead of taking their claims to the local courts, in accordance with the laws of the country, went to the Legations of their countries, soliciting diplomatic help, without even alleging a refusal of justice. In this way special privileges were granted to the foreigners, in prejudice of the nationals.

"In the interests of all, it is necessary that those monetary claims disappear from America for all time, and to that end, nothing would be more efficacious, once the Concert of America is organized, than to refuse to recognize the rights of the Powers to remove any ordinary case from the national jurisdiction, reporting it to the League, should such an attempt be made. The definite realization of such an object would complete the work of our liberators, because, thanks to it, independence would be really complete and effective, sovereignty would be free of the humiliation which some great Powers have been accustomed to impose on it.

"No intervention of other countries in internal questions should be admitted, unless, determining beforehand that there was no material interest in the matter, two thirds of the associated countries decide to intervene. There are still important questions of boundaries which embarrass many American countries, and even though these countries have already joined the League of Nations, which morally binds them to accept its mediation,

such disputes could be dealt with much more satisfactorily through an American League.

"The organization of the American League is, in my opinion, a logical sequence to the Versailles Treaty of Peace, which, in recognizing and expressly accepting the Monroe Doctrine, seems to be desirous of limiting its sphere of action as far as American affairs are concerned. This makes necessary an organization in this continent that will look after American interests in the League of Nations.

"The American League would, therefore, have the following double purpose: *first,* to occupy itself with questions in connection with the extra-continental powers; and *second,* to deal with questions that affect Inter-American relations."

From international, social, and ecclesiastical questions, the Congress was brought to the deepest spiritual consideration by the following letter from Gabriela Mistral, the remarkable Chilean poetess, who has recently come to be recognized as one of the most influential writers on spiritual and social questions in the Latin world:

"I am with you these days in your Assembly, as well as in your evening meetings, as you are thinking of two themes equally dear to you and to me: the School, and the Religious Character of our People. From the other side of the line, among the Catholics, there are a few voices which mingle with yours, and one of them is mine.

"May God Himself preside over your Assembly and enrich you with great and clear thoughts. In these obscure and vacillating times we have great need of the Divine Grace. As yet we are often afraid of many ideas which, like enthusiastic youth, seem to us too lively. But

it is necessary that we admit them to our counsels and permit them to present their case. Some of them are: the social ideals which as yet find no place in our legislation; daring pedagogical ideas which bring with them a new scale of values.

"Referring to your religious discussions, I beg of you, with respect but with vehemence, that you try to bring about an approximation with Catholicism, in order that we may undertake a common task. There are no less than ten general ideas in which we are in complete agreement. We work, Protestants and Catholics, around the vertebral column of Christianity; let us seek more ardently our common points than our differences. In these days when some are talking of presenting a common formidable front against such debatable questions as the yellow peril, let us think of the great Christian opposition to materialism.

"The philosophic doctrine of materialism does not cause us much uneasiness; that which troubles us and challenges us to unity is materialism as a norm of conduct, materialism loosening sanctions, lowering education to the level of an economic training, sinking its teeth into international relationships, counseling the oppression of the weak, and even reaching out to our religions, to kill the mystic element in order to leave only tradition; materialism in the woman who flees from maternity as an economic burden and regards childhood as high-priced merchandise; materialism in wealth, when it takes refuge in its pagan right to deny a living wage; and finally, materialism in the State, when it hides behind the idea of liberty in order to maintain such institutions as legalized prostitution.

"The Spirit exists although we tread it under foot.

Seek ideas with which to defend the culture which is born of the Spirit; study arguments with which to defend religion as the vital breath of nations; disentangle, so far as you may, the net of deception which is weaving itself about our youth, in order to relegate religion to the corner of worn-out rubbish. Seek relationships between the gospel and the present hour, making clear the fact that it is yet full of power to purify human life. Defend also, my friends, the Spirit which exists in Art, and try to create a kind of international legion against the uncleanness which clings to the exhibition of beauty in the cinematograph, in the novel, and in the painter's brush."

Here we have the heart of South America opened to us by some of the greatest representatives of its present-day educational, social, and spiritual life, friends of North America, sympathetic with our ideals and our Christian program to help South America. Severer critics and more fulsome praisers could easily be found, but the more fully North Americans come to know representative South Americans of all classes and of all countries, the more fully persuaded are they that here is the representation of the thought of the great body of our neighbors in the South, from whom we may expect much cooperation.

The questions that trouble honest friendly South Americans in regard to the missionary work of North Americans in their lands are: Why do North Americans not do something in a large way to put Inter-American relations on a spiritual basis and cease putting so much emphasis on purely commercial exchange? Can a Christian program from North America be carried out in South America without its being identified with the in-

dustrial and political "peaceful penetration" of a great country, which threatens gradually to dominate all the life of its smaller neighbor? Will the United States help guide South America in the solution of her great educational problems by putting into Spanish and Portuguese frank discussions of how she is working on these various matters?

Will North Americans really study South American psychology, history, and sociology and take these into account in any work they may undertake in South America —associating more largely with the South Americans as friends and fellow workers?

The friends who frankly expressed their opinions on that "Night of the Open Heart" would not expect all to agree with them. If some of us actually resent such frankness, we might remember the explanation made by Sr. Monzó for his frankness, when he said: "Since the North American delegates to the Congress have come to help us solve our problems, we hope they will not take it amiss that we mention some of the problems which they themselves are facing."

FOR FURTHER READING

"First International Congress of Social Economy." *Bulletin of the Pan-American Union.* April, 1925.

Gulf of Misunderstanding. T. Pinochet. Boni & Liveright, New York.

Hispanic Anthology. Thomas Walsh. Putnam, New York. 1920.

Imperialism and Nationalism. Kirby Page. Doran Co., New York. 1925.

"Inter-American Spiritual Understanding." Gabriela Mistral. *Bulletin of the Pan-American Union.* July, 1924.

Understanding South America. C. S. Cooper. Doran Co., New York, 1918.

World Tomorrow. Latin American issue. Nov., 1924. New York.

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

Chapter IV

1. What differences and what similarities do you think will be found in the promised development of South America as compared with the development of North America?
2. What are the historic conditions which make the present social movements in South America so significant?
3. What changes, for better or for worse, does the labor movement promise for Latin America?
4. What seems to be the social and moral significance of the present student movement? Does it offer any suggestions for service to Evangelicals?
5. Do sex problems in Latin America resemble more those of Europe or of North America? In what way can outsiders help South America in solving these problems?
6. What South American countries seem most advanced in social movements? Why?
7. What other social movements, besides those mentioned in the text, would you hope to see developed in South America?
8. What problems does a greatly increased immigration—which seems likely—suggest for South America?
9. What elements in the "formation of a strong people" seem to you to be omitted by Dr. Alfaro and what is the significance of these omissions?
10. How can the Christian forces of North America best cooperate with South Americans to develop the social movement along the lines of largest service?

IV

CHANGING SOUTH AMERICA

When Colonel Roosevelt returned from his trip to South America, he said that just as the most remarkable developments of the nineteenth century had taken place in North America, so the most wonderful developments of the twentieth century would take place in South America. To the discerning traveler of recent years it would seem that this prophecy is already being fulfilled. Where else are such remarkable changes taking place?

This does not mean, of course, that South America has solved all her problems. From forty to eighty per cent of her people are still illiterate, and some ten millions of native Indians are not yet assimilated into national life. She still has great landed estates on which peons by the millions are even now in bondage. The questions of a stable political life, a strong middle class as a balance wheel, a readjustment of the old social order to new democratic forms, immigration, public health, and the founding of a proper moral and spiritual basis to assure permanence in national life—these and many other problems are still pressing for solution.

But the interesting and encouraging thing is that there is a renaissance movement which is fairly startling in the way that is challenging the old intrenched order. Physically, great stretches of territory that have been far removed from access are being opened up. Rapid steamship connections with Europe, North America, and Japan are making easier the exchange of life between South America and the rest of the world.

There seems to be every indication that South America is headed for large developments. In the first place, she has the physical basis for such growth. Beginning at the Rio Grande and stretching on down through Mexico, over Central America, beyond Panama, through Colombia and Venezuela, the Andean countries, Brazil, Chile, down through the abounding plains of Argentina to the Straits of Magellan, is the largest expanse of undeveloped, fertile land in the whole world.

During the War these countries began to make a most determined effort to develop their own resources, to diversify their crops, and to manufacture their own goods.

In exportation Chile leads the world in nitrates, Argentina in wool, Mexico in oil, Brazil in coffee, Cuba in sugar, Bolivia in tin, Costa Rica in bananas,—in fact, every one of the Latin American countries is especially noted for at least one product upon which the world is absolutely dependent.

The old idea in the United States was that Latin America, being so largely made up of Indians and illiterates, offered little opportunity for commerce. Business men are gradually awakening to the great error of such an opinion. With all their millions of people, Asia and Oceania bought less from the United States last year than did Latin America. Our foreign commerce with the whole world was thirteen billion dollars in 1920. It would have been seventy-five billions had the business transacted with the rest of the world been in the same proportion as our trade with Latin America.

Latin America, with three times more territory than the United States, has at present about the same population as the United States numbered in 1900 (80,000,000). But her foreign commerce today is twice what ours was

twenty years ago. A hundred years after the United States had won her independence, we had a population of fifty millions and foreign commerce of one and one half billions. Latin America has just celebrated the centennial of her independence and her population is eighty millions, with a foreign commerce of five billions. Can anyone doubt that with more rapid transportation, more scientific machinery, and greater economic efficiency, and with three times the territory, Latin America will, in the next forty years, make a record at least equal to that of the United States from 1880 to 1920? This would mean in 1960 a population of one hundred sixty millions and a foreign commerce exceeding forty billions.

It is doubtful if anywhere else in the world the good results of the World War were so preponderant over the evil as here. These nations, said by Ugarte a few years ago to be on "the margin of international life," have gained by the War a definite place at the council table of the nations. The world at large has a new appreciation of them, both for what they are and for what they may become.

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION

A few years ago Latin America was quite removed from the rest of the world so far as modern social movements were concerned. Her geographical position had kept her out of the great current of modern life as developed in Europe and the United States. But today all is different. The World War brought Latin America to the attention of the rest of the world as a great storehouse of raw materials, and, on the other hand, caused Latin America to begin to partake of the modern social

developments with enthusiasm. Today political revolution in Latin America is being succeeded by a great social revolution.

Remarkable transformations are taking place in the social structure of the continent. Formerly there were only two classes, the rich and the poor, the highly educated and the illiterate. While that condition existed there was little hope for the solution of South America's many social and political problems. With the gradual development of a middle class, with the introduction of a new consciousness of their rights among the laboring people, and with a new appreciation of social problems by the educated classes, most of which came about during and after the World War, there is a breaking up of the old fixed castes, and today the social system of South America is in solution. In former times university students were, for the most part, sons of government officials and members of the privileged classes, preparing themselves to continue the ruling and exploiting of the great mass of peon labor. Recently many of this same class of students have changed their attitudes and are giving themselves to the education of the laborers, working out with them a new and democratic conception of national life.

In order to understand clearly the social movements now beginning in South America, much study should be given to historical conditions in that continent. Professor E. A. Ross, in *South of Panama* says:

> South America is the victim of a bad start. It was never settled by whites in the way that they settled the United States. All the European blood from the Caribbean to Cape Horn probably does not exceed that to be found within the area enclosed by lines connecting Washington, Buffalo, Duluth, and St.

Louis. The masterful whites simply climbed upon the backs of the natives and exploited them. Thus, pride, contempt for labor, caste, social parasitism, and authoritativeness in Church and State fastened upon South American society and characterize it still.

It would be unpardonable for us ever to be puffed up because we enjoy better social and civic health than is usual in South America. If our forefathers had found here precious metals and several millions of agricultural Indians, our social development would have resembled that of the people that grew up in New Spain. Not race accounts for the contrast in destiny between the two Americas, nor yet the personal virtues of the original settler, but circumstances.

Social revolution is expressed especially in four marked movements which are ushering in the break from that conservatism which even yesterday seemed destined to preserve for many years its strong hold. These are the labor movement, the student movement, the feminist movement, and the temperance movement. Leading statesmen of these southern countries have recently given voice to utterances which show the probability that these movements will grow very rapidly.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The pitiable condition of labor in the past in Latin America is generally well known. The two words used to describe the laborer are sufficient to indicate his state: "peon," denoting a financial obligation to an employer not possible to shake loose; and "roto," a broken, ragged fellow. Historically, these conditions were established when the Spanish hidalgos were given grants of land and allowed to force the Indians to labor for them. Country labor was always kept in debt, and town labor consisted

largely of personal servants of rich families. Such public work as was carried on was generally done by prisoners. The relationship between "amo" and "peon" was more or less patriarchal. No such thing as "labor unrest" was ever heard of. The idea of social revolt and of securing better conditions through revolt was absent.

But sooner or later the industrial age had to invade Latin America. The personal relationships between employer and employee were severed. Workmen began to come together in large numbers in cities where they saw a new life, and they began to hear of the outside world and its economic problems. When workmen first heard of the strike as practised by their brothers in Europe and North America, and essayed to invoke it, they were met with a show of military force and compelled to desist. A strike was a revolution. But today the strike is recognized as legitimate in almost all of these countries.

The awakening of the working-man has not been equally marked in all countries of South America. Labor in the tropical part of the continent is still far from grasping any idea of organization for the purpose of forcing better conditions. One hears about labor organizations in certain industrial centers and mining districts near Lima, but these are really mutual societies for insurance and social purposes. Faint signs of an approaching awakening are seen, however, in the little news sheets which these organizations are publishing. The following, translated freely from one of the pitiable little labor papers purchased at a news-stand in Lima, shows their keen desire for a deliverance of which they have heard something but understand nothing.

"Listen, Brother, to my notes of red with which my song is vibrating. I sing to life; death to death! I go

planting roses made of love and truth. Anarchism is my liberating thought. I am the Word which rises in humanity's darkest night and scatters all its pain. Listen, Sister, it is time to rise and greet the morning light which kisses our darkest suffering!"

Far different from these incoherent cries, heard in the night in Peru, are the strong voices in some of the other countries, threateningly demanding new rights and privileges. There has been a welter of strikes on every hand, accompanied usually by violence and stressing the recognition of the union to a greater extent than more money or shorter hours. The cost of living has been a source of discontent everywhere. For the South American countries no reliable index numbers exist, but price levels in a number of countries are probably slightly above those in the United States. Depreciated currency, fluctuating exchange values, and the refusal of the propertied classes to pay their fair share of the taxes have even more increased the pressure upon the lower classes. In Paraguay even the storekeepers shut up shop and joined the population of workers, many of whom, before the War, came and went between Europe and the East Coast countries in a regular seasonal flux. The governments, particularly in Argentina and Brazil, have arrested literally hundreds of suspected foreign leaders, usually Spaniards or Russians, deporting or holding them indefinitely in jail. Not one of these leaders, however, has become an outstanding figure to which a personality or even a name can be attached. Their success must have been due in large part to a discontent lying everywhere close to the surface, which flared up in the wheatfields and the back reaches of the quebracho forests as easily as along the crowded waterfronts of the cities.

Argentina has been the center of the strongest radical influence. Not only the workmen but the students and professors of the universities seem largely to have gone over to the soviet position. The most important labor organization of the country is the "Federacion Obrera Regional Argentina," or, as it is known by its initials, the "F.O.R.A." This remarkable organization has now some 300,000 members.

Chile has had almost as many labor difficulties as Argentina. The country has been ruled largely by an oligarchy of about a hundred families who have been both the owners of the land and the directors of the political and commercial life of the country. The Chilean "roto" has been showing a great deal of restlessness for the last decade. Many people have expected the laboring classes to lead in a revolution which would overthrow the capitalistic régime. The shedding of blood has happily been averted by a recent political uprising which is a remarkable demonstration of the power of Latin Americans to accomplish reforms by civic means.

The laboring classes joined the Liberal Party in its nomination of Arturo Alessandri for presidential candidate. Their platform advocated currency reform, the income tax, protection of national industries from foreign aggression, various solutions for social evils, the education of women and children, prohibition, parliamentary reforms, and the separation of Church and State. The power to awaken a popular interest in politics and to draw the ardent support of his party must be attributed first of all to the personality of Alessandri himself. He is "fearless and resolute, generous and eloquent." He is encountering great opposition from the oligarchy which has been accustomed to exploit the laboring classes and

is now going as far as it dares toward checking the president's proposed reforms.

There is probably no other country in the world where at the present time the daily press is giving so much space to labor movements as in Chile.

Uruguay has had her share of labor troubles, but she has escaped some of the violence experienced by her sister republic across the river by adopting liberal economic legislation. Industrial insurance, old age pensions, protection of women and children in industry, provision for laborers on strike, and many other social laws advocated by the most advanced social workers have been successfully put into operation recently.

In Brazil labor disturbances have not been as general as in Argentina and Chile, but by no means have they been absent. The most violent troubles recently occurred in the state of São Paulo. To appreciate the difficult situation it should be noted that, besides the native Brazilian population, one third of the population of the state of São Paulo is composed of Italians, numbering one million, and that there are also a large number of Germans and many small colonies composed of at least a dozen other nationalities.

THE STUDENT MOVEMENT

The Student Movement is probably the most spectacular of all the agencies attempting to revolutionize the life of South America.

In the universities organization and curriculum follow French standards rather than North American. Most of the lectures are given by professional men or government officials. Consequently there is little personal con-

tact between students and professors. No roll is kept of the students; there are no campus life, no dormitories, no intercollegiate athletics, and very little of what we in the North call "college spirit."

Usually professors and students are hostile to religion, although there are, of course, notable exceptions to this general statement.

Latin American students are very well organized, but their organizations are based on the advancement of the interests of students as against the too often politically controlled direction of the institutions. The students purpose also thus to express forcibly their opinion on public questions and to contribute student aid in solving social problems.

The local student federations make use of two special ways to enforce their demands. They parade through the streets with banners announcing the object of their demonstration; this is called a *manifestacion.* The strike, or *huelga,* is used as an expression of grievance against the interior administration of the school, or against the Department of Education. The dismissal of a favorite professor or the appointment of one who is considered incompetent, an unfavorable ruling or the use of too much politics in educational matters, may call forth such a strike.

The combination of students and workmen is one of the most interesting social phenomena noticeable in Latin America. In 1910 students and workmen came into open conflict in the streets of Buenos Aires with serious results. To see them now working side by side for the forcing of reforms is, therefore, little less than miraculous. It is in Argentina that both the students and the workmen have carried their demands to revolutionary proportions. Stu-

dent riots and strikes have by no means been amusing pranks or diversions. They have resulted in serious fighting and deaths on both sides. In La Plata the police found themselves unable to handle the situation, and soldiers had to be called out. These instituted a siege of the buildings where the students, armed with modern rifles, defended themselves for days. During one of the strikes a student who dared to go to his examination, was shot down in cold blood by his fellow students. In Buenos Aires the rector of the Law School, one of the best-known publicists of South America, was barricaded recently in the Law Building by students, who kept him there until he was rescued by the police reserves.

As a demonstration of sympathy with the students of Cordova, the entire university student body of Argentina went on a three-days' strike, parading the streets and calling long and vociferously for their rights. Following that demonstration, the Argentine University Federation was organized, and a convention was held in July, 1919, to study student problems. As a result of this movement the students have forced the authorities to revise the university system, at least to the extent of giving them a vote in the election of the members of the faculties that are to teach them.

In Chile again and again students and working-men have made common cause. For example, when in 1920, there was a mobilization of government troops on the Peruvian border, the students and working-men stood together in opposition to it. It was the students with the working-men in Peru who recently stood out against the Government dedicating the republic to the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

At San Marcos University is found an illustration not

only of what students are doing for reform but of what young professors—among them, often, those who have been educated in the United States—are contributing to the new day in education. Three departments have been most remarkably changed during the last few years—the library, the museum, and the gymnasium. And the best part of their development rests in the fact that in each case the renovation has been accomplished under the direction of a Peruvian.

The gymnasium is not a development, but an entire innovation. In fact, San Marcos is today the proud possessor of the only gymnasium in a state university in all South America. It is directed by a young Peruvian who was educated in the Young Men's Christian Association College at Springfield, Massachusetts. The physical director of the Association in Lima works very closely with him. The gymnasium is run on the most approved lines of college gymnasia in the United States and is adapted at the same time to the idiosyncrasies of the Latin university. There are now four hundred students enrolled in the department. Everyone must have a thorough physical examination and must follow the types of exercise prescribed for his peculiar case. Not only have some very remarkable physical transformations taken place, but students have been entirely re-made mentally and morally.

The reorganization of the library of San Marcos has been a most remarkable work, carried on by a young Peruvian, of part Chinese blood, who was educated at Yale University. The premature death of this brilliant student is lamented by all who knew him and all who pass through this remarkably transformed department of old San Marcos. In former days the list of works in the

library was kept in ponderous tomes with little reference to classification. If the lists were scarcely classified, much less so were the books themselves. Today every book and magazine is listed and cross-referenced in up-to-date card catalogs. A large amount of fresh material has been added to the library. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has contributed some five thousand volumes of the best American literature. These are placed in a separate section. The collection of magazines published in the various countries of America and Europe is one of the best to be found on the continent. In passing, it is interesting to note that in answer to the question as to what magazine was most sought after by the students, the librarian replied, *La Nueva Democracia,* the magazine published in Spanish by the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America.

Another side of student life in South America is shown in the New International Student Camp conducted at Piriapolis, Uruguay, by the Young Men's Christian Association. The governments of Brazil, Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay for several years past have paid the traveling expenses of a part or of all the delegates going from their schools, colleges, or universities. The highest diplomatic representatives of these and other nations make official visits to the encampment and speak to the students in behalf of what the camp stands for. The Secretary of State for Uruguay furnished round-trip railroad tickets from his capital for all delegates to the camp. The Minister of War loaned from the Army Department all tents and other needed equipment. Both these officials came in a Uruguayan cruiser to visit the camp. The latter declared the camp to be making a larger contribution to international peace among the South American nations

than any other agencies now at work there. The Chilean Minister in an extensive State paper to his Government reported his observations to such good effect that urgent invitations have come from students and State to extend formal organization to Chilean students.

The student delegates come to the camp largely unacquainted with one another and with the principles to be considered. Before the ten days of Christian companionship, united sport, and serious thought are ended, prejudices are disarmed. The last evening is called "The night of the open heart," with opportunity and an atmosphere for perfectly free expression. One law student voiced the sentiment of many by saying:

"Men, I have a confession to make. When my fellow students asked me to represent them at this camp, I declined in anger at the thought that they should consider me willing to attend a meeting held under religious auspices. They pressed the invitation a third time before I accepted. My father and mother have been fighters of religion, and I have thought it my patriotic duty to do what I could against religion in my country. But I must confess that I never heard of religion as you men interpreted it—something inside a man which makes him happy and useful. This has opened up to me a new world."

THE FEMINIST MOVEMENT

Women are now coming to take prominent place in all the social movements. The first cause of the remarkable awakening of women in South America is found in the growing interest in the outside world, an interest which all South Americans are rapidly developing.

The woman's movement first took form in a simple coming together of the higher class women for charitable purposes under the auspices of the State Church. In countries like Argentina, Uruguay, and Chile, where the woman's movement is the strongest, they have been gradually developing an independence of the Church and are now found to be working out their own problems. These women are more largely concerned with social betterment, community service, the education of the poor, etc., than they are in the securing of suffrage for women, although the latter is the principal platform in the organization of several feminist societies.

Large numbers of women, heretofore prohibited from participating in the solution of great social and educational problems because of their seclusive limitation to their own families and social circles, have begun to take a part in the discussion of the great surging questions stirring their nations. Many women have entered industrial occupations.

THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT

The temperance movement is felt in every country of Latin America at the present time, and it is especially strong in Chile, Uruguay, Argentina, Peru, and Brazil. It had reached such strong proportions in 1923 that at the Pan-American Conference held in Santiago that year, the official representatives of the American governments took cognizance of it. The Conference recommended that the governments forming the International American Union should bring about a gradual diminishing of the consumption of alcoholic drinks until the problem of alcoholism has been finally solved. This is to be brought

about by the adoption of a policy which shall introduce:

(1) A system of progressive taxation on the traffic and sale of alcoholic drinks; of hygienic and sanitary measures, fines, and penalties tending to the repression of fraud in the manufacture and sale of alcoholic drinks.

(2) Measures looking toward the establishment in the public schools and colleges of compulsory teaching of hygiene, physiology, and temperance, so illustrated as to show graphically the consequences of the use of intoxicating liquor.

(3) A study of the influence of nutrition in its relation to the consumption of alcohol.

(4) A restriction of the consumption of alcoholic liquors by the closing of saloons on holidays and the prohibition of the sale of such drinks in the vicinity of schools, workshops, and naval and military establishments.

(5) The promotion through the cooperation of national and municipal authorities of propaganda along the line of social hygiene, demonstrating the consequences of intemperance, and promoting likewise the creation of anti-alcohol reformatories.

SOCIAL WELFARE MOVEMENTS

There has been a remarkable development in the last few years in social welfare movements throughout the continent. The increase in the number of hospitals and dispensaries and the promotion of institutions for the training of nurses have been very marked in most of the Latin American countries.

The movement that most markedly arrests one's attention, however, is the movement toward child welfare that

seems to have taken root in every Latin American republic. The Mothers' Clubs of Buenos Aires are now celebrating a Baby Week every year. Brazil organized a child welfare exhibit in connection with the first National Congress on Child Welfare. National child welfare organizations have been reported in various centers in Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Peru, and Ecuador, and at least in the larger cities of Colombia and Paraguay there are child welfare associations. Four international child welfare congresses have been held, the most recent in September, 1924, with the object of discussing child welfare from the standpoint of medicine, hygiene, sociology, and legislation. Perhaps most attention has been given to the physical side of child welfare, as indicated by the increased number of milk stations, public dispensaries, maternity clinics, and day nurseries.

However, by no means all the attention has been given to this phase of child life. Public playgrounds are being established in many of the republics. Perhaps Uruguay leads in this activity, which was, in the first instance, brought about by the work of the Young Men's Christian Association. Argentina is also well advanced in its playground program.

The Boy Scout movement has had an unparalleled development throughout the continent. Complete statistics are not available, but according to a report at the recent international gathering of Boy Scouts in Copenhagen over thirty thousand Scouts were reported in only six of the South American republics.

While the movement among girls has not been so extensive, there has been in a number of the South American republics a corresponding effort to organize girls' clubs, such as the Camp Fire Girls, Girl Reserves, etc.

There are indications of an interest in the study of juvenile delinquency, and some slight progress has been made, particularly in Argentina, toward the separation of juvenile from adult delinquents. But the movement has not yet made appreciable headway.

In a number of the republics there are special departments in the government itself charged with the promotion of child welfare; as, for example, in Brazil, which maintains a government council of assistance and protection to minors.

Dr. Max J. Exner, after a recent visit to South America, says:

> The sex social problems with which social hygiene concerns itself are found in aggravated form and extent in all South American countries which I visited. Prostitution is prevalent and deeply intrenched in all the cities visited. It is taken for granted by the public as a social necessity or at least as inevitable. There is as yet little conviction that it can be eliminated or greatly minimized. Venereal diseases are very prevalent. There is a high rate of illegitimacy and there is little social stigma attached to it. . . .
>
> In spite of this general situation, the outlook for progress toward more wholesome conditions for the future is more hopeful than I had thought possible. This is true for the reason that in all the countries visited I found a few informed and progressive leaders who were seeing the necessity of attacking these problems on more modern and constructive lines than were being followed up to the present, and certain progressive movements, forces, and programs were found to be under way. . . .
>
> It is significant that the leaders of most of these countries are studying closely the programs and methods which have been developed in the United States and are copying them. . . .
>
> It is obvious that as a basis of real progress in bringing about more wholesome sex social conditions there needs to be an eleva-

tion of the status of womanhood in South America. In my opinion the progress of the feminist movement in these countries is one of the most important factors in the attack upon social hygiene problems. . . .

"THE FORMATION OF A STRONG PEOPLE"

The following résumé of an address by Dr. Gregorio Araoz Alfaro, one of the outstanding men of Argentina, the President of the National Department of Hygiene, is an illustration of what South Americans are thinking.

I desire for my country only preeminence in the pacific realm of hard work, of happiness, and of culture. I desire that greatness which is found in the perfection of beneficent hearts in a larger economic development, in the development of health and happiness in general. A country's power is not denoted by its armies and its navies. It is, above all, the result of general force in culture, in health, and in riches. Not only Argentina but all the Latin nations are in their formative period. Some of us who are more advanced have developed with a certain appearance of giants, but we are often too tall for our splendid bodies, and we are exposed to many dangers. As Alberdi once said: "South America places all her hopes of a great future in the fertility of her soil and beauty of her climate. This is a great error. Poor soil often makes strong men because poverty obliges a man to be a son of his own efforts." Let us not boast, then, of our great natural riches. These are not valuable in the hands of any but honorable men. Riches are not found in the soil. They are found in the men who work the soil.

One of the first things that Argentina needs is a larger population. There are two things which we must study if immigration is to be improved. Immigrants must be selected. Only strong and healthy people should be welcomed. The second need is a reform in our present land laws in order that the immigrant may be able to secure land. It is easy today, as in the past, to buy a thousand hectares of land, but it is almost impossible to buy four or five hectares, and this is our curse.

We need to eliminate disease. The most common is malaria. In certain periods of the year seventy, eighty, and ninety per cent of the population of some parts of the country have been attacked by malaria. This means at least the complete incapacity for work of these people for days at a time, which, calculated on the lowest basis, means a tremendous economic loss.

Alcoholism and tuberculosis are other tremendous handicaps to the development of a strong nation. These bring about especially infantile mortality. There are certain movements against those two forms of degeneracy which ought to have our help. Typhoid fever may be taken as a representative of a whole group of diseases which is undermining the strength of our nation.

Infantile mortality, while greatly reduced in Buenos Aires, is very high in the provinces. In fact, on the average two or three times as many children die in some of those provinces as in Buenos Aires, because of a lack of sanitary provisions. We need very much a special department of the government for the protection of childhood.

We need also a strong educational program. In our primary education we have developed a system which gives entirely too much attention to the appearance of things, loading down the child with exaggerated courses, paying little attention to his physical culture. In our desire to pay honor to certain people and to impress the foreigners, we have multiplied school palaces. And yet there are still about half a million analphabets in the city of Buenos Aires.

In secondary instruction even the most optimistic recognize grave dangers. The mania for graduating doctors by the thousands has led to the creating of many national colleges which do not encourage the practical studies destined to create useful men of initiative. We need fewer doctors, fewer bachelors, fewer authors and orators, but many more industrial and agricultural schools, many more rural schools.

The Commission on Social Movements for the Montevideo Congress closed its report with this challenge:

Great social forces are at work in the South American nations. Out of the vast interplay of these forces something new in the

world is to emerge. What shall it be? Out of the mixture of the surplus populations of the East and the West in a land prodigal in its natural resources and hospitable to all the sons of earth, what kind of a culture, a civilization, is to come? Will it be a materialistic world, or will it be Christian? We do not ask so much will it be Catholic or Protestant, but will it be Christian?

The Commission cannot escape the conviction that the ultimate answer to these questions will depend very much on the forces that are set in operation in these earlier, more formative years of South American development.

Some definite questions that should be faced are these:

"(1) How can the consciousness of their social mission be more fully impressed upon the Christian forces at work in South America?

"(2) How can the Christian groups best cooperate with social movements already operating in the different countries?

"(3) How can competent social workers be found and prepared for their work? Can this training be given in each country or should there be an international Faculty of Theology and Social Sciences?

"(4) What can the Christian forces do in helping toward a solution of the land problem, the peonage problem, the immigration problem, the labor problem, the alcoholic problem, the problem of the status of women, and the problem of international relationships?"

FOR FURTHER READING

Bulletin of the Pan-American Union. "Saving of Babies in Buenos Aires." July, 1924. "Activities of Chilean Labor Office." Sept., 1924. "The Feminist Movement in Latin America." April, 1922.

Men, Maidens and Mantillas. STELLA B. MAY. Century Co., New York. 1923.

New Latin America, The. J. WARSHAW. Crowell Co., New York.

Social Revolution in Mexico, The. E. A. Ross. Century Co., New York. 1923.

South America Today. S. G. INMAN. Committee on Cooperation in Latin America, New York.

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

Chapter V

1. What are some of the principal reasons why North Americans and Latin Americans have so largely misunderstood one another in the past?
2. Was there justification for the suspicions concerning the motives of the United States that were aroused among Latin Americans following the Mexican and Spanish-American wars?
3. Should the Pan-American Union (*a*) be continued with an emphasis on commercial interchange; or (*b*) should it be enlarged to include political questions; or (*c*) should an American League of Nations be organized?
4. Is it advisable for the United States to send military and naval missions to Latin American countries?
5. Should the Monroe Doctrine (*a*) be continued as the policy of the United States alone; or (*b*) should it be made a joint declaration of all American countries; or (*c*) should it be abandoned?
6. Is it wise for Latin American countries to contract loans for the payment of which they must allow foreigners to collect their customs or otherwise limit their sovereignty?
7. Should the United States Government assist its nationals, either by diplomatic or military pressure, in collecting their claims in foreign countries?
8. Is it necessary for the United States to assume the duty of "international police power," as President Roosevelt said, over the smaller countries of America?
9. Is it right to use military force to secure treaties, as in Haiti, which give the United States the opportunity of cleaning up that country in the way we think is needed?
10. Are we in the grip of economic forces which compel the United States to dominate the rest of America; or can we find a way to make economic exchange the servant of spiritual forces and a way to brotherhood?

V

POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS

Future historians will wonder at nothing more than the fact that we Americans have lived on this hemisphere for so many years without understanding one another. It is true that there are certain basic reasons for North American and Latin American misunderstandings. In the first place, we have a different psychology; we are a different people as far as historic background is concerned, and, to a certain extent, as far as ideals are concerned. North Americans are predominantly Anglo-Saxons; Americans in the South are predominantly Latin. But we have this in common, that we are all looking forward to the day when, through the development of our young nations, we shall become great leading democratic powers in the world. This sentiment in the early days united North and South America.

When the Latin Americans won their independence from Spain, they looked to the United States as their example. Most of them practically copied our Constitution. They referred to us as the "great sister nation of the North" and as the "great model republic of the world." Simon Bolivar called the first conference of American nations to meet at Panama in 1826 for the formation of a League of Nations. Our own Henry Clay also saw the great necessity of uniting all American countries. This spirit of friendship went forward until the Mexican War. When, after this war, the United States came into possession of nearly half of Mexico's territory, a feeling of suspicion spread over Latin America concern-

ing what they had heretofore believed to be our idealism. However, during our Civil War we perceived the very great danger that any republic might be parted asunder and became, therefore, more sympathetic with the Latin Americans, who had suffered so acutely from internal difficulties. In 1889 Secretary of State Blaine called together the first Pan-American Conference.

The next important epoch in relations between the United States and Latin America was the Spanish-American War. That war made the United States a world power. It also gave us predominant influence in the Caribbean. The war, of course, was undertaken for the purpose of freeing Cuba from Spain. When that was accomplished, we withdrew our forces from Cuba, after having pressed upon them the Platt Amendment. This amendment gave the United States the right to intervene when it was considered necessary in the affairs of Cuba, and it prohibited that country from increasing its foreign debt or transferring any territory without the permission of the United States.

From this we soon acquired the habit of intervening in the affairs of these small Caribbean countries "for protection of life and property." The building of the Panama Canal added the strategic reason to the ever-increasing commercial reasons for this dominance. Then came the World War, which increased enormously both the strategic and commercial reasons for the United States' control of this region. The War also changed very markedly our relations to many countries of South America that had been securing their capital largely from Europe, for after hostilities began, they were compelled to borrow from the United States.

While during the War the idealism of the United States

raised the stock of this country immensely in Latin America and seemed destined to heal many of the sore spots felt by those countries, the lapse of the United States after the War into a spirit of isolation and exaggerated nationalism at the same time that it increased so largely its financial and political influence in the southern countries, has placed again in the very forefront of international questions our relations with Latin America.

This most pressing of our governmental relations may be discussed under four heads: (1) Pan-American Conferences; (2) The Monroe Doctrine; (3) Inter-American Finances; (4) Hegemony of the United States.

PAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCES

The first Pan-American Conference had as its prime object the development of the commercial relations between the American countries. The one practical result of that conference was the organization of what was then called "The Bureau of American Republics," which was later expanded into the Pan-American Union. The sole object of this bureau at first was the promotion of commercial relations. But in the agenda for the last Conference, held at Santiago, Chile, in 1923, Latin America insisted that there should be included such important questions as an American League of Nations, a definition of America's attitude toward extra-continental powers (a joint declaration of the Monroe Doctrine), etc. The Latin Americans have few trademarks to register, few international claims to collect, few books to copyright, but they do have their sovereignty to protect, their relations to Europe as well as to North America to define, and problems between themselves to settle.

The outstanding victories of the Conference were in three subjects—International American Law, Hygiene, and Social Questions. In the first two a distinct program was worked out. In the third, the Conference called for studies concerning the problems of women and labor and for their representation in future conferences, and made certain recommendations with regard to agriculture, education, and anti-alcoholism. Thus, social questions have been definitely incorporated in the program of Pan-Americanism.

During the entire Santiago meeting two views of the purposes of the Pan-American movement seemed to be struggling against each other: one was desirous of maintaining the status quo of the Pan-American Union, regarding it as primarily for the promotion of business relations, while the other desired to enlarge the movement to function in settling Inter-American problems and to promote cultural, social, and political cooperation between all American countries.

The first indication that the Latin Americans would not be satisfied with the old arrangements was the proposal made by Costa Rica, that the members of the governing board of the Pan-American Union be appointed by the member States, leaving them free to name either their ministers in Washington, as now provided, or other representatives if they desired. The United States delegation opposed this. A final compromise on the subject was reached after some three weeks of struggle. It was provided that the governing board shall be composed of the diplomatic representatives of the American States in Washington and the Secretary of State of the United States, but that any country not having a diplomatic representative in Washington may appoint a special repre-

sentative to the Pan-American Union. The full significance of this proposal is not appreciated unless it is taken in connection with another, made also by Costa Rica, which called for the organization of an American Court of Justice. Thus a complete machinery for handling American questions would be created, with the Pan-American conferences as the legislative body, the Pan-American Union as the executive, and the American Court of Justice as the judicial branch.

Besides the enlargement of the Pan-American Union, another way was proposed to bind the American nations together in a closer union. President Brum of Uruguay advocated an American League of Nations. Just as the United States had opposed the Costa Rican proposals, so it now frowned upon this. It was finally referred to the Pan-American Union, to be reported on at the next conference, which will meet in Havana, probably in 1927.

Another important question considered at Santiago was the limitation of armaments. The failure to agree on disarmament caused bad feeling between Argentina and Brazil, and the former began immediately to improve her army and navy in order to equal Brazil's program. The presence in Brazil of a large naval mission from the United States was strongly criticized by Argentina.

In this connection, the New York *Evening Post* said editorially:

"Argentina's law for the expenditure of 100,000,000 gold pesos upon military armaments, promulgated by President de Alvear the other day, follows legislation for strengthening the Argentine navy passed a few months ago. No one has any doubt as to the reason for these appropriations. A great new barracks system is to be

erected along the northern frontier of Argentina, facing the thirty thousand Brazilian troops which are posted opposite the Argentine province of Corrientes. The policy of Argentina has been peaceful, and she vigorously advocated disarmament at the Santiago conference. To her, $98,000,000 is an enormous sum, for her total estimated revenues under the 1922 budget were only $225,000,000, and left a deficit. She would not take the step unless she were alarmed by the action of Brazil. . . .

"It is high time that this naval mission was recalled. The United States should not only correct the blunder, but make its repetition impossible by asking South Americans to agree with us to call in no foreign missions of the kind whatever."

In Argentina the press and people were much stirred by the Naval Mission, believing, as *La Prensa* said:

"What Brazil has secured with the official United States mission is that South America, especially the River Plate countries, which inspire the Brazilian naval policy, know that Brazil can count on the decided moral aid of the United States, which Brazil calls her 'old and loyal friend.' This moral authority has been indisputably given, and it strengthens Brazilian militarization, both within Brazil and abroad."

An Argentine lawyer, Dr. Enrique Gil, writing in *Our World* (October, 1923) under the title, "Is Uncle Sam Fomenting a New War?" said: "In the case of the Argentine-Brazilian controversy over disarmament, a certain act of the United States has unwittingly become the keystone of the situation. In December, 1922, the United States sent to Brazil, in addition to the commission already detailed there, a mission of sixteen commissioned and nineteen non-commissioned officers of the navy. The

opportunity was seized immediately by those unfriendly to the United States. The major charge was that of inconsistency. You have Mr. Hughes, on the one hand, preaching peace and disarmament to the big powers, and on the other fostering an unfortunate rivalry between Argentina and Brazil. Many critics further argued: Does the United States expect that the sending of such a mission to Brazil will reduce the size of that country's navy? Is it not likely that American manufacturers of arms will be favored with orders from a new and willing customer?

"Many who justify Washington say that if Argentina wishes, the United States could send her just as good a mission. But they miss the point, because they do not relieve the United States of the charges either of inconsistency or of using a commission to foster the interests of the manufacturers of arms. . . . Those who know the understanding between the United States and England regarding American affairs believe that had Washington been in earnest in extending the benefits of disarmament to the South Atlantic, it would have been a relatively easy matter to present to England the true facts and to secure her deferring any action."

Secretary Hughes defended the sending of the Mission, saying:

"In response to the request of Brazil, we sent them our naval mission. It was a request which could not well have been refused, or the refusal of which would not have precluded a similar mission from elsewhere. If such a mission were to be had, there was no reason why we should not furnish it; not that our influence should be thrown in the direction of competition in armament or in the stirring up of strife, but, decidedly to the contrary,

that our influence should be most helpful in avoiding waste and provocative outlays and in having necessary training conducted in accord with the aims of peace. The influence of the United States is always exerted to that end and this, despite the efforts of those who would stir up anti-American sentiment, is fully realized in Latin America. We acted in connection with the request from Brazil as we should act in response to a similar request from any other country. While I cannot fail to express regret that at the recent conference at Santiago some provision was not made for the limitation of armament, the subject should be viewed in its true light and the matter should not be distorted or its importance exaggerated."

The United States delegation to the Santiago Conference made a favorable report to its government as to the accomplishments of the Santiago Conference. Therefore, at this time, Dr. Estaneslao Zeballo, former Minister of Foreign Affairs in Argentina created a sensation by an address made at the Institute of Politics at Williamstown, Mass., in which he declared, among other things, the following:

"What occurred in Santiago and the inexact, the incomplete, exaggeratedly optimistic report made to the Government of the United States demands a rectification in the interest of Pan-Americanism which today is facing a profound crisis. . . . The Conference has perturbed the tranquillity of the situation in general and especially among certain groups like the Rio de la Plata group. . . . Do the good people of the United States know these things which so profoundly affect their interests? . . . The United States has a great mission in favor of Pan-American friendship, but the government must reorganize its work on another basis, taking into account the discon-

tent which exists in the greater part of the Latin American countries."

The Santiago Conference put up to the United States the biggest program in Pan-Americanism that this country has ever faced. But the United States delegation at Santiago was opposed to this program. It was Latin America who pushed an American League of Nations, an American Court of Justice, an American Labor Bureau, a codification of American International Law, and a continentalizing of the Monroe Doctrine.

These matters were all referred to the Pan-American Union and therefore to the American governments. The Latin Americans left Santiago with the firm determination that the Pan-American Union should not be the graveyard of these subjects, but that it would be forced to a real consideration of them, and that the North American people themselves should pronounce on the following questions: Is this negative policy toward all machinery for political cooperation, for the adjustment of disputes, and for the solution of the larger Inter-American problems representative of the sentiment of the majority of the people of the United States? Are they opposed to an American League of Nations? Are they opposed to an American Court of Justice? Are they opposed to the arbitration of pecuniary claims? Are they opposed to any cooperative declaration concerning the Monroe Doctrine, claiming that it is entirely unilateral? Do they really wish to dominate the Pan-American Union? These questions Latin America is insistently asking.

Opponents of an American League of Nations or to the Pan-American Union exist in Latin America as well as

in the United States, but for opposite reasons. A movement for the formation of a Latin American League has been given new impetus by such leaders as Dr. José Ingenieros of Buenos Aires, who began the publication of a paper for its advocacy; by Dr. Alfredo Palacios of the University of La Plata, who lectured at universities in Mexico and South America on the subject; and by Sr. José Vasconcelos, Minister of Education in Mexico. This movement is largely sponsored by the intellectuals. Regarding it Dr. Alfredo Palacios says:

"My attitude is frankly one of opposition toward the Pan-American movement; because I know that in a union of that sort the weak and separated peoples of South America must become the satellites and servants. . . . The only salvation for these democracies of the South lies in the mutual identity of race and their inevitable unity in destiny, thus bringing about a confederation of all of them to constitute a great power, like the Republic of the North, with which it might deal thus, in analogous conditions."

In reviewing these questions in the magazine, *Nosotros,* (Oct. 1922), Dr. José Ingenieros, the most widely read author of Argentina, said: "We do not desire to be, nor could we continue being, Pan-Americanist. The famous Monroe Doctrine which appeared for a century to be our guarantee of political independence against European conquest has revealed itself gradually as a right of the North Americans to intervene in our affairs. The powerful neighbor has developed to the highest extent the régime of capitalistic protection. . . .

"Let us make it clear that we are citing facts without condemning their authors. We are not slandering or scoffing at the North Americans. The danger of the

United States does not come from her inferiority, but from her superiority. She is to be feared because she is great, rich, and strenuous. The thing that interests us is the possibility of our balancing her power in order that the independence and sovereignty of our nationalities shall be saved."

The great question facing America is, what is the best form of Inter-American political organization in order to bring about the best results for all the continent? Or is it better to have none except the present loosely organized Pan-American Union, devoted largely to commercial exchange?

NEW PHASES OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE

The declaration by the United States delegation at the Santiago Conference that the Monroe Doctrine was unilateral, and the celebration on December 2, 1923, of the one-hundredth anniversary of the pronouncement of the Doctrine, were the signal for a widespread discussion of the meaning of the Doctrine, both in the United States and in Latin America. An epitome of the two different points of view is brought out well by the two following quotations.

Secretary of State Hughes, speaking on the Monroe Doctrine before the American Bar Association, at Minneapolis, in October, 1923, said:

> We have established a waterway between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans—the Panama Canal. Apart from obvious commercial considerations, the adequate protection of this canal—its complete immunity from any adverse control—is essential to our peace and security. We intend in all circumstances to safeguard the Panama Canal. We could not afford to take any different

position with respect to any other waterway that may be built between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. . . .

As the policy embodied in the Monroe Doctrine is distinctly the policy of the United States, the Government of the United States reserves to itself its definition, interpretation, and application. This implies neither suspicion nor estrangement. It simply means that the United States is asserting a separate national right to self-defense, and that in the exercise of this right it must have an unhampered discretion.

So far as the region of the Caribbean Sea is concerned, it may be said that if we had no Monroe Doctrine, we should have to create one, and this is not to imply any limitation on the scope of the Doctrine as originally proclaimed and as still maintained, but simply to indicate that new occasions require new applications of an old principle which remains completely effective.

Among many answers to these words of Mr. Hughes, an article by the Venezuelan publicist, Jesus Semprum, published by a number of the leading Latin American magazines, stated:

The Monroe Doctrine is as abstruse as elastic. The proof of it is that today Secretary Hughes, instead of giving a precise and definite interpretation, desired by all Central and South America, has given an elasticity and a mysterious character more amplified and threatening than ever. General opinion is that the unexpected declarations of Mr. Hughes are due to the recrudescence of lack of confidence and prejudices of the other American republics in recent times, above all since the Santiago Conference.

So the declaration of Secretary Hughes evidently indicates that the White House has felt so much irritation because of the failure of the Santiago Conference that it has renounced its moderation and the apparent sweetness of diplomacy and has resolved to assume once for all the truculent attitude of the big man of the neighborhood who, club in hand, cries out for the benefit of his neighbors his insolent intentions.

If, in tropical America, there were a powerful nation, conscious

of its duties, of its situation, and of its dangers, Mr. Hughes' discourse would inevitably plant a *casus belli.* For that which Mr. Hughes declares so openly, in precise and significant language, without leaving the least doubt, is that the United States will intervene as sovereign in the rest of America and especially in the Caribbean region whenever it so desires; that whenever they like, they will occupy by force American territories which they desire; they will enforce on other peoples the necessary obedience to carry out their own designs, to foment their own interests, and to impose their unquestionable economic and political sovereignty in the New World.

It is not possible to interpret in any other way the declaration that the only judge of the rights of the United States in America in relation to the large number of neighboring nations is the United States itself.

LOANS TO LATIN AMERICA

Before the World War the United States was a debtor nation to the extent of about three and a half billion dollars. But now the figures are entirely reversed. The United States Government reports that at the end of 1923 American investments abroad exclusive of war loans were eight billion dollars. Another billion dollars was loaned to foreign governments in 1924, and financiers estimate that this will be an average for the next ten years at least. Even in little Cuba our investments are now amounting to the enormous sum of $1,360,000,000, a little more than the United States' investments in Mexico. This means that we are becoming the bankers of the world. Today we go out frankly and necessarily from the economic standpoint to battle with the rest of the world for world markets. We need the raw products that less developed countries have in order to carry on our immense industrial civilization.

In June, 1924, the Department of Commerce announced that "there are 610,000,000 American dollars invested in Latin American public securities and $3,150,000,000 more in Latin American industries. Besides this great amount, we did a trade with Latin America last year (1923) amounting to $1,844,000,000." Among these recent loans which have involved criticism are those to Haiti, $15,000,000; to Bolivia, $24,000,000; to Cuba, $50,000,000; to El Salvador, $6,000,000; to Peru, $7,000,000. The Haitian loan, arranged through the Department of State, was protested by the Haitian-Dominican Independence Society as illegal because it was based on "military invasion of United States military forces, . . . imposition of Treaty through 'military pressure' (words of Admiral Caperton), etc." As to the Cuban loan, the bankers announced it was "issued with the acquiescence of the United States Government" and press dispatches reported, that "while the executive department of the Cuban Government in trying to straighten out its finances was considering a foreign loan, most of the Havana papers charged that American financiers were attempting to force on Cuba another $15,000,000 obligation in order to bring the country completely under their control, open the way to fiscal intervention, and place the island in the same category as Haiti, Santo Domingo, Nicaragua, and Panama. Party leaders of both houses of the Cuban Congress were greatly opposed to the loan, denouncing it as 'another link in the golden chain binding Cuba to the chariot of the United States.'" (New York *Times,* July 15, 1922.)

The Bolivian loan not only pledged customs to pay the loan, but put the collection of all the taxes and revenues

of the country under the supervision of a Fiscal Commission of three persons, two of whom are North Americans, representatives of the bankers.

The Salvadorian loan provided for the collection of the customs by an American agent of the New York bankers, and the referring of any differences between the lender and the borrower to the Secretary of State of the United States, who, in turn, agreed to refer the question for final arbitration to a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. The bankers in advertising the loan stated:

"It is simply not thinkable that, after a Federal Judge has decided any question or dispute between the bond holders and the Salvador Government, the United States Government should not take the necessary steps to sustain such decision. There is a precedent in a dispute between Costa Rica and Panama, in which a warship was sent to carry the verdict of the arbitrators." (*The Nation,* Vol. 117, No. 3042.)

United States citizens, either government officials or representatives of bankers, are now collecting revenues in Santo Domingo, Haiti, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Peru, and Bolivia. North American financial advisers are permanently employed or financial missions have recently visited Cuba, Panama, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Colombia, Ecuador, and Chile. While no one could question the splendid, scientific service rendered by many North American specialists who are giving disinterested help along these lines, neither can one ignore the increasing expressions of fear by experienced people both in this country and abroad as to the dangers to international peace involved in this tremendous control over other nations.

At the Institute of Politics at Williamstown, Mass., August 18, 1924, there was a discussion concerning foreign loans, reported by the New York *Times* the next day as follows:

Mr. Strauss discussed the various requirements insisted upon by bankers making foreign loans. He said that in some cases the political instability of the borrowing Government made it absolutely necessary to make the collection of revenue by a foreign collector generally appointed by or with the approval of the lenders. He admitted that small nations disliked this requirement more than any others. Critics in this country, Mr. Strauss declared, should recognize that underlying all participation, direct and indirect, of the United States Government in such agreements was the necessity imposed on the United States by the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine.

"If European nations are to respect our policy, which keeps them from applying physical force to recalcitrant debtors in the Americas," he said, "they will naturally expect us to see that the engagements of such debtors are met, and our Government must, therefore, in appropriate cases, be prepared to assume responsibilities to that end or be content to let foreign Governments apply such pressure as they see fit in their own way. This necessity involved theoretical contradictions between our party platforms and the stern facts of an actual situation. On the whole, our Government has sustained this dual part with some tact and some firmness, and always for the benefit of the country in question."

In dealing with American bankers' loans to Latin America, Dr. Rowe urged that such loans be subject to Government control and conform to standards designed to prevent irritation and misunderstandings between private parties; for if the conditions of the loan were onerous, it was inevitable that the Latin American masses would view the exactions as those of the people of the United States. He advocated that every such loan be submitted to this Government for careful scrutiny of its terms.

In taking issue with Dr. Rowe, Mr. Crosby said that as bankers went into this business, they would learn to guard against the

dangers cited, and that neither investors nor reputable bankers would want to have anything to do with the kind of loans Dr. Rowe feared.

"Among the arguments against governmental control of foreign loans," Mr. Crosby went on, "was the danger of an indirect control by the United States Government over Latin American countries borrowing from American bankers." Mr. Crosby joined Dr. Rowe in taking issue with Mr. Strauss' statement that this Government should help collect debts from Latin America for the European investor.

The *Christian Century* (June 25, 1925) says:

The world owes us some twenty billion dollars. If we should endeavor to increase our holdings in foreign enterprises for another decade, it is quite within the range of possibility that America would become the most feared and envied and therefore the most hated nation of the world. . . . All this may outrage the good American citizen who cannot understand why nations should hate us just because we are good enough to lend them money. But this naïve attitude of the average citizen is precisely what makes the whole situation so ominous. . . . It simply shows that we are in the precarious position of exerting more power than we know we possess and exerting it through the logic of economic law and not by the free decision of public opinion.

WHAT LATIN AMERICANS THINK

Latin American papers are filled with dark forebodings because of these ever-increasing loans. As Jesus Semprum says in a widely copied article:

Today the principal arm of imperialism in capitalistic America is the loan, its accompanying technical mission, collector of customs, and the consequent direct intervention of foreigners in the domestic business of the debtor. These weak states know this and yet they continue to solicit loans from the bankers. It is said that these loans are indispensable for the exploitation of the

natural riches of the country. Yet many of these countries are poorer than they have been before the loans were made.

The United States Senate has recently taken cognizance of the growing relationships between the United States Government and loans made by our bankers to Latin America and, following addresses by Senator Borah and others, Senator Ladd introduced a bill (December 2, 1924) providing that United States Government officials be prohibited from (1) "engaging the responsibility of the Government of the United States to supervise fulfillment of financial arrangements between citizens of the United States and foreign governments or (2) giving official recognition to any arrangement which may commit the Government of the United States to military intervention in order to compel the observance of alleged obligations, or to deal with any such arrangement, except to secure settlement of claims through ordinary channels of law." This bill is still pending.

HEGEMONY OF UNITED STATES

The fact that the United States is richer and stronger than all the other countries of America combined necessarily gives her a predominant influence on this continent. Secretary of State Olney stated the extreme conception of this when he said, "The United States is practically sovereign on this continent." President Roosevelt probably stated a more widely accepted view when he said that the Monroe Doctrine forces, in cases of "chronic wrong doing or impotence in America, the exercise of an international police power." In support of this idea the United States has, since the Spanish-American War, sent

military forces for brief or protracted occupation to Cuba, Santo Domingo, Haiti, Nicaragua, Panama, Honduras, Guatemala, and Mexico.

Of the various Latin American countries occupied by military forces of the United States, more data is available about Haiti than about the others because of an investigation made by the United States Senate. During a revolution in Haiti in 1915, that country was occupied by the military forces of the United States. The United States Senate Investigating Committee in acknowledging that the United States authorities had forced an unwilling treaty on Haiti, said:

"The American representatives in the opinion of your committee influenced the majority of the Assembly in the choice of a president. Later they exercised pressure to induce the ratification by Haiti of a treaty with the United States, precisely as the United States had exercised pressure to induce the incorporation of the Platt Amendment in the Constitution of Cuba."

The following official dispatches indicate some of the means employed to secure the signature of the treaty, along with special privileges to the United States and a new constitution giving Americans the right to hold property, a right which Haitians withheld and were still opposed to granting.

The Senate Investigating Committee report shows that Admiral Caperton, in charge of the United States forces landed in Haiti, cabled Washington as follows:

"Successful negotiation of treaty is predominant part of present mission. After encountering many difficulties, treaty situation at present looks more favorable than usual. This has been effected by the exercising of military pressure at propitious moment in negotiations."

The Haitians continued to resist strongly acquiescence to the treaty, however, so Secretary Daniels cabled the following to Admiral Caperton:

"Call on President Dartiguenave before the session of Senate which will pass upon ratification of treaty and request that you be permitted to appear before that meeting to make a statement to the President and to members of the Cabinet. On your own authority state the following before these officers: 'I have the honor to inform the President of Haiti and the members of his Cabinet that I am personally gratified that public sentiment continues favorable to the treaty; that there is a strong demand from all classes for immediate ratification and that the treaty will be ratified Thursday. I am sure that you gentlemen will understand my sentiment in this matter, and I am confident if the treaty fails of ratification that my Government has intention to retain control in Haiti until the desired end is accomplished, and that it will forthwith proceed to the complete pacification of Haiti so as to insure internal tranquillity necessary to such development of the country and its industry.'"

In a message from General Eli K. Cole to the Secretary of the Navy, June 17, 1916, showing the difficulty of substituting the constitution proposed by the United States, which would give Americans the right to hold property, for one which Haitians proposed, denying this right, he said:

"Antagonism National Assembly to foreign ownership of land such that no endeavor short of dissolution will prevent passage Constitution along lines reported my 13107."

On June 18, General Cole notified Washington: "Unless contrary instructions received, if necessary to prevent

passage proposed Constitution, I intend dissolve National Assembly, through President, if possible, otherwise direct."

In reply the Navy Department vested General Cole "with full discretionary power." The next day General Butler, acting under instructions from General Cole, dissolved the Assembly. The Haitian newspapers were ordered strictly by General Cole to omit all comment on this action.

A debate in the United States Senate, as reported in the Congressional Record of January 21, 1925 (pp. 2269-72) gives an insight into both sides of the question about whether this increasing intervention in the affairs of Latin America ought to continue or not. The following are abstracts:

Mr. Oddie. The intervention of the United States into the internal affairs of the Republic of Haiti in July, 1915, was unavoidable. The President of Haiti had been brutally murdered, his government overthrown, and the steadying presence of a foreign military force was imperatively necessary. Obviously there was only one foreign State that should, in view of the international understandings in force over that region, land troops—the United States. The intervention of the United States was fully justified and was undertaken as a matter of duty. Mr. President, this morning (January 21, 1925) the Washington *Post* carried an editorial which gives a very clear and concise history of the occupation of Haiti, as follows:

The "Invasion" of Haiti

"When American marines took over the island in 1915, conditions were fast relapsing into savagery in the interior country, while on the coast the breakdown of the native government left the population open to a reign of terror. The United States authorities first restored order and made it safe for an unarmed

person to appear in public. By vigorous rule they instilled something of respect for person and property into the better-class Haitian.

"They then invited the native officials from the old régime to sit in with them while they organized a government. They passed laws and explained to the Haitians what these meant. They built or helped to build schools. They established hospitals and taught native 'doctors' the principles of medicine and surgery. They built roads into the wilderness of the interior and routed out the bloodthirsty bandits who haunted the forests. They sterilized pest districts and disinfected polluted waters.

"They took over the native constabulary, drilled it, armed it, and organized it into an effective military body with a patriotic morale. They preached through it the necessity that Haitians should love their country, obey their government, and protect helpless foreigners. Finally, they reorganized the finance and commerce of the island.

"Should the United States have done all this or not? There can be no doubt about it. Under the obligations of the Monroe Doctrine, supplemented by the Root corollary wherein this Government formally recognized the duty to remove conditions in Latin America which might give cause for European intervention, this country faced an unescapable task."

The Haitian people are better off a thousand times because of our occupation than they had been for over a hundred years. They had revolution after revolution and changes in their form of government innumerable until our occupation in 1915. Since then there has been peace and security; the people have been able to cultivate their little tracts of land and raise livestock in security; and they have confidence in us. . . .

Mr. King. . . . With all due respect to the Senator, I venture to assert that the record will not support all of the positions which he has taken, and I cannot assent to the conclusions which he has reached. . . .

The Senator states that we have been actuated by "humanitarian motives" in our occupation of the island. Mr. President, that is always the plea of the strong nation when it oppresses the weak. Haiti does not belong to the United States. It is inhabited by people who are different from the great majority of

this Republic. They want their independence. . . . The Haitian people have at times had bad and vicious rulers, and injustices have been perpetrated for which no defense can be made. The same may be said of other nations. . . .

We had no right to invade Haitian territory, and we certainly had no right to impose a hard and cruel treaty upon the Haitian people under which we have claimed the right to occupy the Haitian state and control the government which we established. The Senator said there was an international understanding. What governments had the right to join with the United States in an "agreement" to place Haiti under the dominion of the United States?

The Monroe Doctrine, Mr. President, may not be perverted and used as a pretext to justify aggression by our Government or the infringement of the sovereign rights of states upon the Western Hemisphere.

The misinterpretation of the Monroe Doctrine has been the occasion of anxieties and fears upon the part of some of our Latin neighbors. It is important that it be justly and properly interpreted, otherwise it will be a recurring cause of offense and a haunting specter threatening the amicable relations which should exist between this Republic and the Republics to the south of us.

The Senator says that the Haitian people are a thousand times better off now than before the United States sent its military forces to the island. I do not know the standard adopted by the Senator to measure their progress from the low and degraded position which he attributes to them at the time of American occupation and the high state of felicity which he would have us believe they now enjoy under the military control of the United States. Does he mean that their feelings toward the United States are more friendly now than before? Does he mean they are better off financially or physically? Mr. President, I think the Senator did not speak in terms of moderation.

There are many Haitians of culture devoted to their country who are competent to hold high official position and discharge with fidelity the duties which such positions would entail. I frankly admit that neither they nor others within the Haitian state could give the Haitian people as progressive and as liberal

a form of government as that which we enjoy, or which may be found in many other countries in the world. But whatever government they maintain would be their own.

Every act of conquest has been accompanied by pious protestations upon the part of the conquering nation, that it sought the physical and moral well-being of the subjugated people. In my opinion, our duty is clear. We should announce to the people of Haiti that on the first of July we shall withdraw from the island.

MR. ODDIE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will examine the records of the Navy Department proceedings during 1915, at the time the occupation started, he will find, I think, an answer to his question in regard to the international understanding. The French and German forces were there at the start. It is a well-known fact that if the United States had not acted, one of the foreign nations would have taken charge of Haitian finances, their customs and revenues, in a very short time.

MR. KING. Mr. President, I shall not ask for a division, because I know the temper of the Senate. I shall not say the Senate is imperialistic. That would be unparliamentary. It might be untrue. I shall say, however, with due respect to my colleagues, that I think they fail to appreciate the great opportunity which we have in this particular instance to emphasize the high purposes of this Government. I think we are losing an opportunity to bring to the United States the friendship and the love of the Latin American republics.

MR. BRUCE. I should like to ask the Senator whether he can recall just how many of the rulers of Haiti have died peacefully in their own beds?

MR. KING. Many of the Haitian Presidents were assassinated. I believe that if we should withdraw from the island there would be sporadic outbreaks, factional strife, and possible revolution.

Revolutions, even though they have been accompanied by bloodshed and often by atrocities and assassinations, have been struck at autocratic government and have laid the foundations of more liberal government, though such foundations have been laid in blood. Even in our own Republic, dedicated to liberty, there was a mighty conflict, appalling in its magnitude, which destroyed hundreds of thousands of the flower of American manhood and

mposed financial burdens upon the people which persist even ıntil this day. . . .

Mr. Bruce. I should like to ask the Senator how many roads here were in Haiti when the American occupation took place. My information is that there was nothing there but bridle paths. . . .

Mr. King. I concede that the roads were limited, . . . that many of the Haitian rulers were cruel and imposed upon the people ınjust laws which deprived many of them of their liberty. But conceding all that and more, I still insist that the United States ıas no right to control the Haitian people by military force. . . .

Mr. Bruce. I assume that the point of view of the Senator is hat it is much better for Haitians to be free than civilized.

Mr. King. I want the Haitians both free and civilized and freedom and civilization will the sooner be realized if they are not ıeld under the control of another power. . . . If they are not civilized, how long will it take us to civilize them? Shall we remain until they reach the standards of civilization which fastidious Americans prescribe? . . .

I am pleading only for the right of self-government, for the right of the people, whether white or black, to have their own freedom in their own way, to work out their own problems, ınafraid and undeterred by the power and might of a great ıation. This Nation has not been made the policeman for the world.

The National Catholic Welfare Council recently made ın investigation of conditions in Haiti and recommends ıs follows:

The United States Government should close the door it has opened in Haiti to the establishment there of a network of American owned plantations through which Haitian small farm owners will be turned into peons and day laborers. It should do all possible to retain and extend ownership by Haitian farmers of the land they till. American influence in other West Indian Islands has meant the growth of the plantation system and the gradual expropriation of the people's land, says the report. The

masses of the people are changed into landless, low-paid laborers and peons, working on plantations that are owned principally by Americans. It is declared that this same process has been begun in Haiti since the occupation through permission laws which the American Government dictated and through the establishment of plantations in sugar, pineapples, and cotton by Americans. Because the plantation system has only begun in Haiti, there is time yet for another policy to be pursued successfully. The United States can change the policy it initiated. It still holds its power over the Haitian Government.

SOME HOPEFUL MOVEMENTS

Several important recent actions by the United States Government have shown a desire to better Pan-American relations. Foremost among these was the withdrawal of the Marines from Santo Domingo and the announcement of their withdrawal from Nicaragua, where improved financial conditions had enabled the Government to buy back the railroad and the national bank.

Negotiations for the withdrawal of the Marines from Santo Domingo were begun by President Wilson, but agreement on terms was not then reached. However, in the summer of 1923, a provisional government, agreeable to the heads of the three leading political parties, was set up, and in March, 1924, a permanent president and congress were elected. This was part of the plan agreed upon by the two countries, which also called for the ratification of most of the acts of the United States Military Government which had ruled the country since 1916, and the continuance of the collection of the customs by United States officials.

The gradual adoption, after much discussion, of the various peace pacts proposed by the Second Central

American Peace Conference, held in Washington in the fall of 1922, also produced numerous favorable results.

The Tacna and Arica dispute, the Alsace-Lorraine question of South America, which had been presented to the League of Nations to arbitrate, was referred to President Harding when the Monroe Doctrine prevented action by the League. Both Chile and Peru presented their arguments in good spirit before the President, and this resulted—at least before the decision has been rendered—in a better feeling among all concerned. The decision rendered calls for a plebiscite of the inhabitants of these provinces, and General Pershing left the United States on July 20, 1925, to preside at such a voting.

The recognition of Mexico by the United States, August 30, 1923, held up for three years because of American property questions, caused a distinct relief all through Latin America.

The prompt adoption by the United States Senate of the conventions signed at the Santiago Conference was no doubt significant of our desire to gain the good-will of Latin America. Four of these conventions were commercial, applying to bettering relations as to customs, trade marks, etc. The fifth was the treaty proposed by Sr. Gondra of Paraguay, providing for a commission of inquiry to be set up when any two nations of America might find themselves in disagreement, with the promise that they would delay at least a year before beginning hostilities.

A number of important Pan-American conferences were held during 1924: in May the Pan-American Conference on Electrical Communication, in Mexico City; in October, the Pan-American Child Welfare Conference, in Santiago; in November, the Pan-American Sanitary Con-

ference, in Havana; in December, the Pan-American Scientific Congress, in Lima. Besides representative North American delegations attending these gatherings, a number of commercial delegations have visited Latin America—the most important being one to Mexico in October. Also United States government officials, for example, Secretary of Labor Davis and General Pershing, have gone on special missions of courtesy and investigation.

Secretary of State Hughes took occasion to set down several times during the period under review his assurance that Pan-American relations have been greatly improved, regretting the "hopeless twist of mind of those who accuse us of cherishing an imperialistic policy." Speaking at the Republican State Convention of New York on April 16, 1924, he reviewed recent events and added:

"In short, during the last three years, we have been able to convince the Governments and the peoples of the American Continent, not only by our declarations, but by outstanding example, that ours is a Government respectful of their rights, as well as regardful of our own, and that we are always willing to join with them in the furtherance of those larger purposes of international right and fair dealing upon which, in the last analysis, the peace and progress of the entire continent must depend."

Is Mr. Hughes right or is the other view, expressed by so many others, right? A widely known North American who has lived and traveled in Latin America for twenty-five years recently wrote the author:

"My last year in South America was embittered by just such suspicions among the people and expressed in the newspapers. We 'Yankees' are not liked in Latin

America, but worse than that, we are feared and suspected. . . . The United States is, blindly and not of deliberate policy—Fate, let's call it, advancing by materialistic imperialism. I see no way to a successful opposition. The path is that of Rome, and Spain, final crash—when, let us hope, there will come what I may call a real spiritual democracy. But you and I cannot hope to live to see it!"

Are we, then, in the grip of a cold economic law? Do we not believe that spiritual forces are superior to material forces? We believe that the heart of our nation beats right; that it is not cant when we profess idealism and real willingness to share, with no ulterior motives, the best of our life with less fortunate peoples, assisting them to attain strength and justice and to protect their proper sovereignty.

Would one of the practical ways to solve these relations with our Southern neighbors be to organize, as they suggest, an American League of Nations and an American Court of Justice? Could we go the second mile, by trusting ourselves in an organization with the weaker countries of Latin America? Could loans to small American nations be made by concert of powers, just as loans to Austria, Germany, and other countries have recently been floated?

Should we hold to the more strict one-sided interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, or should it be shared by all America? Can we not find a way that will benefit both parties, where in exchange for capital and manufactured goods, there is given only just and proportionate amount of raw materials in return? Is it not possible to reduce somewhat at least the profit motive, putting in its place the friendship motive? Can we go on taking mortgages

on these countries, without piling up trouble for ourselves as well as trouble for them? Is it not up to the Christian business men and Christian statesmen to work out Christian relations with the people who are bound to them economically? If it is true that we are now so rich that we have a mortgage on the world, is it also true that the world has a mortgage on our soul?

It is most encouraging to see that the leading men in the United States Government are advocating a new approach to our Latin American neighbors. President Coolidge said in a recent message to Congress:

"While we are desirous of promoting peace in every quarter of the globe, we have a special interest in the peace of this hemisphere. It is our constant desire that all causes of dispute in this area may be tranquilly and satisfactorily adjusted. Along with our desire for peace is the earnest hope for the increased prosperity of our sister republics of Latin America, and our constant purpose to promote cooperation with them which may be mutually beneficial and always inspired by the most cordial friendships."

Adding to the words of our President the following declaration of Sr. Cesar Zumeta of Venezuela, the importance of Inter-American relations is clear:

"We are either on the eve of another Dark Age or we are facing a great new epoch in human history. A united America can bring this new epoch into the world. The government at Washington has the power to say whether we will have this American unity, with its consequent blessings, or whether we will have the divisive and ruinous elements of Europe enter this continent, with the consequent ruin of civilization."

FOR FURTHER READING

Caribbean Interests of the United States, The. C. L. Jones. D. Appleton & Co., New York. 1916.

Congressional Record. W. E. Borah. Vol. 62, Chaps. XV-XXI.

Destiny of a Continent, The. Manuel Ugarte. Knopf, New York. 1925.

Diplomatic Relations of the United States and Spanish America. J. H. Latané. Doubleday Page & Co., Garden City, N. Y. 1920.

Foreign Loans. United States Senate Hearings on S. Con. Resolution 22, Washington. Government Printing Office. 1925. This embodies the most complete statement in print of the recent financial relations between the United States and Latin America.

"Imperialistic America." S. G. Inman. *Atlantic Monthly.* July, 1924.

"Inquiry into Occupation of Haiti and Santo Domingo." U. S. Senate, Hearings of Select Committee, 67th Congress, 1st Session, Part 2.

"Is America Imperialistic." Sumner Wells. *Atlantic Monthly.* Sept., 1924.

Mexico; an Interpretation. Carlton Beals. Chaps. 4, 5, 6, 7, 17, 18, 19. Huebsch, New York. 1923.

Mexico and the Caribbean. Clark University Addresses. Steckert & Co., New York. 1920.

Mexico on the Verge. E. J. Dillon. Doran Co., New York.

Missions and World Problems. C. H. Fahs. Chap. IV. Association Press, New York. 1925.

Monroe Doctrine, The. Alejandro Alvarez. Oxford University Press, New York. 1924.

One Hundred Years of the Monroe Doctrine. H. C. Thomas. Macmillan Co., New York. 1923.

"Pan American Conferences and Their Results." S. G. Inman. *Southwestern Political and Social Science Quarterly.* March, 1924.

Senate Report on Haiti.

Syllabus on International Relations. Parker T. Moon. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1925. For full bibliography see Chapter XIV on Imperialism in Latin America.

"Through Santo Domingo and Haiti." S. G. Inman. Committee on Cooperation in Latin America, New York. 1919.

QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

Chapter VI

1. Do you personally regard the Latin American as your equal? If not, in what respects do you consider him inferior or superior? Why?
2. What are the sources from which the average citizen of North America receives his ideas of Latin America and vice versa?
3. What position do you consider Latin America will hold in future world life? Why?
4. In what ways can the social and educational idealists of the United States share their experiences with Latin America?
5. How is it that North Americans have done so much more in developing philanthropic institutions in other parts of the world than they have in Latin America?
6. How can North American business men who get profits out of Latin America be more largely interested in helping these countries in solving their educational and moral problems?
7. What results can be expected by North America if her material influence in South America continues to multiply so rapidly and only feeble efforts are made to increase her spiritual influence?
8. How can we multiply our spiritual ambassadors to South America?
9. What are some practical things that you and your group can do toward building a real spiritual fellowship between the American peoples?

VI

BASES FOR INTER-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

The experiences of fifty North Americans during the spring of 1925 and many other ventures in friendship with South Americans seem to justify the setting down of a few principles which North Americans in their pursuit of closer understanding might well adopt. No doubt the South Americans with whom these friendships have been cultivated could speak equally frankly concerning things which it would be well if they were to practise if South Americans are to eliminate their prejudices and do their part in the formation of this friendship. We also hope that some South Americans will write as frankly and critically of the attitudes they themselves ought to hold as we are trying to do here in regard to such North American attitudes as will build this friendship. South Americans who honestly face the misunderstandings of the past recognize that blame is to be found on their side as well as on ours, and that only as both peoples make the effort, can they find the desired harmony.

From the standpoint of North Americans the following would seem to be at least some of the bases for this friendship.

First, equality. There is nothing that quite aggravates the Latin American so much as the patronizing attitude which is often assumed toward him. President Wilson showed his clear understanding of this when he said: "We must prove ourselves their friends and champions

upon terms of equality and honor. You cannot be friends upon any other terms." There is probably no more difficult thing in the world for the Anglo-Saxon than to keep from showing his feeling of superiority to other peoples. This is likely to be especially true of North Americans dealing with Latin Americans.

A North American lady who was living in Santo Domingo, when showing some presents she had received, said that they had been presented to her by some of the "foreign ladies." It developed that she meant Dominican ladies. She regarded them as "foreigners" in their own land. *Cabbages and Kings,* by O. Henry, and a thousand other writings of this burlesque character have done more, probably, than all our real study of the history of Latin America, of its great writers, and of its life of culture, to shape our ideas concerning these countries. Even some missionary propaganda in its strong emphasis on the illiteracy, illegitimacy, immorality, and lack of character of the South American may have given a disproportionate emphasis to the worst side of Latin American life, and failed to reveal the best.

The Commission on Literature, reporting to the Montevideo Congress, said:

"The United States sends to Latin America bankers and commercial agents but few educators and critics who can appreciate its marvelous literary development. That ignorance was strikingly set forth recently by Prof. William R. Shepherd, of Columbia University, when, in his words of welcome to Dr. Manuel Gamio, of Mexico, one of the greatest anthropologists of the present generation, he said something like this: 'I am sorry that you are a Latin American and a Mexican—and do not misinterpret my words. What I mean is, that if you were a French-

man, a German, an Italian, or an Englishman, your place as an anthropologist would be recognized and your works would be read by the majority of cultured North Americans. But of you North America will say what the Pharisees said of Christ: "Can anything good come from Nazareth?" ' "

A South American Ambassador in Washington said not long ago, in complaining of the critical spirit of Americans visiting his country: "You will not find everything there just as you have it in the United States, and you must not expect more than we have for ourselves. We are very glad to share what we have with anyone who comes to us in good faith, but you should not be too critical of what we have to offer. Our countries are new countries, and we welcome your interest in their development, but we don't like to be told that we are backward and slow. If you don't like our hospitality, you should stay at home."

That is a rather general complaint against North Americans who visit South America for the first time. The traveler usually knows very little Spanish, and he is likely to be annoyed because all the nations do not speak his language. If he is very provincial in his point of view, he is likely to conclude that everything is done wrongly because it is done differently from the way he is used to at home. Many North American tourists, and even some of them residents of many years in South America, see none of the good traits of the people, none of the wonderful public and private charities conducted by them, nothing of the beautiful spirit of refinement and culture that captivates the open-minded. At times one finds in the cities North Americans who spend their free time maligning the good people of that city and putting wrong im-

pressions into the heads of tourists who come to them for information. Even if the traveler is fortunate enough to have pointed out to him some of these things which are hid from the ordinary tourist, he is likely to forget their charm or value when he finds himself unable to get a room with a bath. How much of our North American life revolves around a porcelain bath tub, and how far this shapes our thinking on international relations when we travel abroad, is often a revelation. And if the "private-bath complex" does not get us, the "fork-complex" rises up to feed our race superiority. How many North American tourists would vote any country a "success" in which every room had a private bath and every citizen gave preference to the fork? How many would be more impressed with these things than with a Mistral, a Braga, or a Gandhi?

It was interesting to hear each member of the returning North American delegation, at a meeting in the salon of the *Santa Luisa* before arrival at Panama, mention especially the deep impression he had received in regard to the South Americans as the peers of people in any other part of the world.

As Bishop Francis J. McConnell put it:

"Nobody who has traveled to this conference from the North will return to his home without feeling a vast debt of gratitude for the quickening of insight and zeal which has come from contact with the South Americans. I hope to see the day when Christian relationships between the countries to the North and those to the South shall be upon a basis of mutual influence, with only such reliance upon official authority anywhere as will keep open the channels for that mutual influence.

"One of the reports here adopted recommends that

special lecturers, of proved ability, be set apart to bring from Europe and the United States the latest phrasings of Christian thought in those countries. Why should such enterprises be one-sided? We of Europe and the United States on our part need profoundly the light which South American Christians can throw upon the Gospel Truth. The fineness of the Spanish and Portuguese languages as instruments contributes to a peculiar fineness of mind on the part of those who use those instruments. The Latin quality of mind in the service of the gospel is a gift to be used under a sense of trusteeship for Christians everywhere. A language reveals not merely a peculiarity of expressing truth but of seizing truth as well. We need every ray of light which can break forth from the word of God, and some rays, or some colors, can first break better upon the Latin type of understanding than upon any other."

Second, granting the right of self-expression. South Americans will not express themselves in theological organization, in their political life, in their social reform, or in their moral emphasis exactly as North Americans have expressed themselves. This does not mean that they will not make their special contributions to all these realms of life.

The late Ambassador from Brazil to the United States, Sr. Nebuco, speaking of what North and South America might learn from one another, said:

"I do not mean that we would ever attain your speed. Nor do we wish it. You have broken the record of human activity without breaking the rhythm of life. You have made a new rhythm for yourselves. We could never do that. For the Latin races, *festina lente* is the rule of

health and stability. And let me say that it is good for mankind that all its races do not go at the same step, that they do not all run. Dignity of life, culture, happiness, freedom, may be enjoyed by nations moving slowly, provided they move steadily forward."

Gabriela Mistral says:

"Some believe that the only means of accord between nations is through a unification of customs, of forms of economic life, of the criteria of truth. Others believe that each group of human beings can progress, can even reach the apex of perfection, each in its own way. . . . I had, until a short time ago, a certain disdain for the languid Orient and that which in our Latin countries is most like the Orient—the Indian. But seeing a Mexican *mixteco* at work on his lacquer, my mind was illuminated by the truth. The man . . . worked with a calm delight which was pure love. The work that a machine might have accomplished in a brief moment cost the Mexican an hour's labor; but his work did not suggest something ill-conceived. Laboring almost with tenderness, his was the calm of the workman who loves his work. The same desire which the poet has in choosing the right adjective was to be found in the slow, skilled hand of the Indian worker in lacquer. Then I understood that though this man had no highly developed faculties . . . the Indian workman and I were equals—not because of the charity of the Christian mandate, nor because of the potentially false equality of citizenship, but in the very essence of things. . . .

"The friendship of the different peoples sought by the Pan-American Union would be easily attained if we were all imbued, to the farthest limit of consciousness, with the concept of *dissimilarity without inferiority*. . . .

"To stamp the relations between the countries of the North and South with the standards of Christianity, to place conscience, individual and national, above material and personal interests: that is the task. The more or less purely immediate political relations of today must be replaced by a spiritual movement in which the cooperation of a great State will not be looked upon as the domination of the weak by the strong, but as the immensely human helpfulness of a great and prosperous nation which has found itself and which has already reached maturity toward other states which are slowly and painfully striving toward the same goals."

As for the attitude of the North American missionary agencies, the Commission on the Church and the Community of the Montevideo Congress says:

"The second influence in shaping the sentiment of a community is the power of the missionary to free himself from all prepossessions favorable to his own type of national life or culture. There has been, in the past few years, a very general recognition of the truth that Christianity in the United States, for example, is not to be identified too closely with the social institutions of the United States. With the Latin American peoples coming to a new national and racial sensitiveness, the wise worker from abroad will substitute the idea of a fatherly contact with the people by that of a brotherly contact with them."

Third, a new advocacy of liberty of thought. So much has been said about conservatism, fanaticism, and dictatorships in Latin America that many people think of these as conservative lands. They are so in many senses. But the leaders of thought both in government and in the educational world are today advanced liberals. It is

strange to find them looking upon the United States as reactionary in its intellectual attitudes.

The dismissal of professors from the universities of North America because of their liberal thought has not been understood by South American university men. There is a general feeling in these liberal circles that North America has become reactionary during the last few years. These circles were very much surprised when told about the work of such papers as *The New Republic* and organizations like the Foreign Policy Association, the Social Service Commission and The Commission on International Justice and Good-Will of the Federal Council of Churches, the new movement for the Christian Way of Life, the inquiries concerning relations between capital and labor, and the steel strike investigation by the Interchurch World Movement. If South American liberal thought is to become friendly to North America, it must be made more aware of these movements and of the attitude assumed by the broad-minded Christian and social leaders of the United States. There must be a larger willingness on our part to discuss frankly with them the great problems which are facing the world.

We remember that while the great Reformation of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries was going on in Europe, South America remained isolated. A similar thing is happening today with some North Americans in that continent. Great reformations have taken place in their home country, but they have been out of touch with them and so, for one of their fellow countrymen to bring in these new social ideas means sharp criticism.

How far is Sr. Navarro Monzo right, when he says: "The Latin countries in America, along with the Latin countries in Europe, need to pass through a reform, but

this reformation must be their own, a reformation of the twentieth century, not of the sixteenth.

"The modern world, especially the Latin world, believes little in churches. This is the truth and we might as well face it. Any ecclesiastical organization which involves a clergy, a professionalism of life and preaching, arouses suspicion. Therefore, any attempt to introduce into Latin America an exotic church can only count on a partial success.

"But I firmly believe that the religious, ethical, and social principles of Jesus will stand. The future belongs to them. But Christianity is destined to stand as an ideal, not as a doctrine or as an organization. Christianity ought to be founded in the command of the Master, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' From the beginning Christians have felt the necessity of meeting together for mutual exhortation, for collective prayer, and to participate from a single cup and to eat the same bread, symbols of love. This necessity will always be felt by the disciples of Christ; the church of tomorrow will . . . be composed probably of small homogeneous groups of people who, because of like tendencies, will enjoy meeting together in common prayer, in mutual council, in speaking to one another concerning the things of the soul; and, when they face the most profound things, to keep silent.

"When shall we see here such groups which would help save our culture and solve our problems? I confess that I do not know. The only thing that I do know is that its appearance does not depend on an intellectual movement, but on a great spiritual revival. This, men may in a certain way prepare for, but they cannot produce. For those who have not passed through a religious experience to speak of the presence of God in the soul, of

intimate communion with Him, is the same as for the blind to speak of the varied colors and for the deaf to speak of music. How shall we make them understand these things? Such understanding does not depend on an intellectual effort but on moral purity. This I know well, and because I know it, I have no illusions about the efficacy of all kinds of activities, and of preaching which only affects the intelligence. The man who shall save Latin America, must be not a wise man, but a saint."

Fourth, the sacrifice of institutional life for its own sake. One of the central ideas in most mission work in South America has been to build up the organization, since it was believed that membership in this organization was the way to cultivate in individuals the Christian life. The Christian way of life as such without any particular reference to organization has not been primal. Most missionaries would favor social work, but with many this would be only for the sake of getting people into the church—a point of contact in order that the real message might be delivered. Few, probably, think of social service itself as Christian work. South Americans recognize this and are often suspicious of it as fish get suspicious of the bait. They have had long years of watching jesuitical methods and have become exceedingly wary of service rendered which means the contracting of certain obligations.

A study of the life of Christ would be of great help in deciding this fundamental question. Is a hospital a good thing only because it helps, by curing the body, to get people to listen to your preaching message? Is a school a good thing only because it wears away prejudice and gives a more direct avenue for the minister? Is social service

good only because it predisposes people to come to your church? How many quotations already made from South Americans can you recall that show the desirability of pure, unselfish service without any *quid pro quo,* if we are to win any large confidence among the people?

The persistency of denominationalism in spite of the earnest and honest desires of denominational leaders for cooperation is one of the strange anomalies of the missionary situation in South America today.

Much is spoken in interdenominational meetings of the power of unity and the desire for closer cooperation. It is surprising, however, when denominations come into direct contact with a question which necessitates some sacrifice of their denominational program, how difficult it is for them to make such sacrifices. In Montevideo, if there was one thing more evident than any other, it was the need of a better prepared ministry among the Spanish-speaking people. Yet when the practical question of opening the International Faculty of Theology and Social Sciences was put up directly to the denominational boards, they failed to endorse it because their denominational programs did not seem to lend themselves to it.

The sacrifice of the institutional life for the purpose of serving the people, the placing of the real needs of a Christian program before denominational pride, is absolutely necessary if North American Christians are to win the friendship of South American liberals.

Should we not study ways of mingling with and serving South Americans without expecting them to adopt our organizations? A certain number of Christian workers might be set aside to live among groups of people, students, laborers, etc., who would not be expected to report each year concerning the progress made in tying

these people in a definite way to an organization. The idea recently advanced by the Quakers of sending young men to live among people of foreign lands to get their point of view and to make friends with them, with no other results expected, would be a splendid one for Christian forces to carry out in South America. If college professors from North America would spend sabbatical years in South America, if retired business men of the international mind, artists, literary men, social workers, and others would spend considerable periods of time with our Southern neighbors, carrying forward a deliberate program of cultivation of friendship and service, it would have large effect. Are such things possible or are they too idealistic for a practical people like us to carry out?

Fifth, an improvement of the whole North American impact on South American life. One of the experienced women members of the recent South American tour, who spent a good deal of time with her fellow Americans living South, spoke often of how far separated the three groups of North Americans seemed to be, the business group, the diplomatic corps, and the missionaries. And yet all these are equally representative of North America before the South Americans. When they bear a very widely differing testimony as to what our life means, what are the people among whom they live to think?

Should we work to get all our fellow citizens to unite in a common Christian impact to gain friendship, or should we admit this as too difficult and frankly state our disapproval of certain diplomatic and commercial policies of some of our countrymen and emphasize the spiritual phases of life which struggle against our materialistic side?

The North Americans attending the Montevideo Congress were impressed with the importance of this problem. Said Dr. Robert E. Speer: "How are we to sustain our proper friendly relationships with all groups who go out to make impacts on these countries and at the same time retain our purely spiritual character? In China today our missions are all snarled up with antipathy against the Western world. The same, if not greater, problem exists in South America, and it is nearer and more closely related to us. In the last ten years we have trebled our holdings in Latin American securities, according to Mr. Julius Klein of the Department of Commerce. There are forces at work with which we seem to have no influence. We must study the question very carefully. How far can we or ought we to go in this matter of dealing with our political and commercial relationships? Ought we to go into this matter at all, or should we hold ourselves to the strictly evangelistic view of our work? We have different minds among us in this matter. Most of the missionaries would probably advise a more conservative attitude. But there would be others whose consciences would not be satisfied in any such way. We must certainly be careful in this field of relationships without any shirking of real responsibilities."

The Commission on Special Religious Problems says:

> The Evangelical movement has been criticized as a tool of imperialistic politicians. This leads us to make one or two remarks.
>
> (1) The term Pan-American should be abolished from all connection with Evangelical propaganda in South America. It is a term distasteful, even in its political acceptation, to many of the best minds on the continent.
>
> (2) It is difficult for the popular mind in South America to

appreciate the fact that men belonging to a powerful sister nation can work in other countries without being inspired by selfish or national interests. Service rendered for the pure love of God, of truth, and of human beings is difficult to grasp. For that very reason the Evangelical missionary should avoid all entangling associations with commercial or political interests in order that he may stand forth in the full light of day as God's representative and no other's.

The Commission on The Church and the Community said:

It would be folly not to recognize the obstacle to foreign missionary work in Latin America created by the real or supposed policies of the United States toward her neighbors to the south. The facts themselves are rather embarrassing, with or without explanation. The seizure of Panama by President Roosevelt, the taking over of Santo Domingo's custom-houses to ensure the payment of debts to foreign creditors, the actual occupation of Santo Domingo by United States troops, the practical conquest of Haiti by United States marines, the seizure of Vera Cruz by the United States Navy in 1914, the punitive expedition into Mexico under General Pershing in 1916—these are facts open before all the world.

We who know the United States are thoroughly clear in our own minds that the people of our country have no hostile designs against any Latin American nation. Yet all through the speech of the citizen of the United States is likely to run an assumption of superiority based on physical force.

An article in a recent issue of *The Federal Council Bulletin* said:

It is a fair question for the churches of the United States to ask themselves how far they may expect results from the work of the missionaries they send to Latin America so long as the overwhelming conviction among Latin Americans is that the United States Government is inclined to be materialistic in its

relations with its Southern neighbors. At least it is good strategy in the advancement of the Kingdom of God to raise the question whether greater progress can be made in Latin America by sending more missionaries to preach a message of Good-will in those lands, or whether more advance would be made by helping those that are already there by clearing up some of the difficulties that our own official and commercial attitudes have placed as stumbling blocks to the work of these missionaries.

Fortunately there are found among the North American and other foreign colonies in South America some of the very finest Christian men and women, who are exerting great influence for Christian ideals and are doing much by their lives as well as by their contributions to help the missionary. But others of the fellow citizens of the missionary discredit the cause of Christ both by work and by action. In most of the capitals of South America church services are held in English for the benefit of the foreign residents. In some of these cities well organized, union churches make every effort to serve the English-speaking community. Their support, however, is too often dependent on a few most zealous and generous ones, rather than on the majority of the colony. If these English-speaking union churches could be enlarged and made strong influential centers through which the foreign colonies would function in building Christian relations with the nationals, immense good would be done.

The foreign firms which take enormous profits out of these countries sometimes show most commendable spirit in providing social welfare activities for their own employees. But they rarely ever contribute anything to the great social and educational enterprises of the land, which would mean so much to the building of international fellowship.

Sixth, a larger emphasis on the spiritual side of Inter-American relations. The visit of fifty North American Christian leaders to South America in connection with the Montevideo Congress was one of the most important gestures that North America has made toward the spiritual life of the southern continent. The eagerness of South America to know about the inner life of North America was shown wherever these visitors went. "You make great efforts to build up commercial relations with us. Give us of your rich accretions in the realm of education, social philosophy, ethics, and soul culture," said South Americans over and over again.

A recent visitor to Argentina reports:

"There is no one here to talk of this spiritual and intellectual side of Inter-American relations. We could render a large service not only for Argentina, but for the betterment of our own relations with South America by fostering a real program of intellectual and spiritual exchange between the two countries. Italy, Spain, and France are sending mission after mission to South America these days. These are not commercial missions, but are composed of the most representative authors, university professors, and scientists, who are received with tremendous enthusiasm as they lecture on the literature, art, and educational life of their countries. We should have from three to six of our best university men in Buenos Aires continuously, acting in various capacities, as exchange professors, as technical advisers, and public lecturers."

On a recent visit to Lima, Peru, the author was met by a delegation of students who made an appeal that the United States send to Peru representatives of the best elements of her life that would teach Peru the secret of

the educational, social, and moral progress of the United States.

"Our country is perishing for the lack of moral stamina, sacrificial service, and practical idealism," they said. "Send us men to lead us into this new life. If you only come to develop our material resources, to work our mines, and to cultivate our rich soil, Peru itself will remain poor in the real values of life. We have been trusting for a hundred years in literature and professionalism to save us. We are now disillusioned as to this. But we believe that to go to the other extreme of materialism will bring results just as disappointing. We call on your universities, your great foundations in social sciences, your leaders in moral and spiritual movements, to reach out a hand to the young men of Peru."

North American philanthropists have built great colleges and contributed large sums to cultural and spiritual enterprises, not only in China, India, Japan, and the Near East, but even in the most advanced countries of Europe. Not counting the institutions supported by mission boards, how many institutions are supported by North Americans out of pure free will, taking, for example, Yale in China, Peking Medical, Robert College, the American University Union of Europe, the American-Scandinavian Foundation, and special efforts like the restoration of the Louvain Library, all undertaken purely on the spiritual basis of friendship? How many similar institutions are supported by North Americans in Latin America? The only North American school of college rank in all the twenty republics of Latin America is MacKenzie College of São Paulo, and this is now almost self-supporting. Practically the only large North American philanthropic agency working to any extent in Latin America, with the

exception of occasional scientific expeditions sent to remote sections, is the Rockefeller Institute, which works especially for the extinction of hookworm. More than a decade ago a group of educators in the United States was formed to develop in Mexico City a North American college somewhat similar to Robert College of Constantinople. But despite all the agitation, that institution is no nearer being built today than it was ten years ago. In the meantime, North American industry has taken out hundreds of millions of dollars from Mexico's soil.

Bishop Wilbur P. Thirkield, writing in the *Christian Century,* March 27, 1924, says:

"It is interesting to contemplate the contribution to Pan-American confidence, security, and peace that would have been made if the United States had said to Brazil, in response to her request for an American naval commission: 'Under the terms of the Monroe Doctrine you are assured of protection from all foreign aggression, and with our program for Pan-American peace, cooperation, and good-will, no neighboring republic will invade or molest you. What you need is not ships, but schools, and we'll help you build them. What you need is not millions in armament, but millions in railways to develop your wasted imperial resources.' . . . It would appear that instead of such a consistent and pacific program the United States has encouraged a big military budget in a nation already with strained credit and undeveloped resources and has provided for the education of her youth in the arts of modern warfare and in the methods of aggressive military strategy."

The great question raised by Mr. James McDonald, of the Foreign Policy Association, will be answered by the United States in its relations to Latin America. He says:

China and Mexico show themselves but two aspects of a single challenge—can modern industrial civilization cooperate harmoniously with weaker and less industrialized peoples for the common good of all? Or, must contacts between machine civilizations and those more primitive peoples be marred by exploitation, sometimes harsh and tending toward domination, to be answered first by sullen suspicion, then by impassioned resentment, and finally by violent revolt? The events of the last few weeks thrust these issues upon us with dramatic imperativeness. Europe and the United States not less than China and Mexico are now on trial before the world.

The Guatemala newspaper *El Diario* published the following editorial recently:

More important than political treaties, than the solemn promises of friendship and love, than congresses and conferences, the great cultural endeavors of North America could contribute to the drawing together of the Americas. The truth of what we say is proven by the great work done in all parts of the continent by the Rockefeller Institute and Evangelical missions.

No one ignores the positive benefit which the Rockefeller Institute has brought about. Its work has not been unilateral. In combating the hookworm and penetrating to the most remote parts of the tropics, it has propagated the truth concerning popular hygiene everywhere.

Although less in evidence, but not for this reason less important, especially for our mental and moral progress, has been the work of Evangelical missions. By means of ministers splendidly educated and really moral, American Protestantism, giving itself to the humanitarian endeavor of liberating our masses from their ignorance, has carried forward the splendid good news of a pure and human-hearted religion to a large part of our people.

Thanks to heroic patience Protestant missions have attained notable triumphs. Today seed sown is beginning to bear fruit. In many humble people a real religious sentiment, reflective and tolerant, is beginning to be substituted for the absurdities of fanaticism and the intolerance of the past. The Sunday preach-

ings of the Evangelical pastors have been, at the same time, happy means of propagating ideas against crime and vice. Latin America knows how to appreciate all that has come from these humanitarian institutions.

How the whole of the North American impact on South America can be made more certainly Christian is one of our great problems in the development of Inter-American friendship.

North American help in increasing the power of the Christian movement in South America is, of course, the first way which presents itself to a thoughtful disciple of Jesus. The Montevideo Congress made a large appeal to North American Christians for such help. Brotherly service to South America in helping her to secure the institutions and the workers which the Montevideo Congress alone called for would advance the cause enormously. But we need to employ many different means of spiritualizing this impact.

We need a number of spiritual ambassadors going up and down this America of ours, cultivating understanding and friendship by interpreting to all the people the great truth that God has made of one blood all the nations and has called each and every one to make its own particular contribution to the work of the world.

We have had such ambassadors in the past. Dr. Horace Lane went from the United States to Brazil to establish himself in business. But he fell so deeply in love with the Brazilians that he gave himself to helping them educate their youth. As the founder and president of Mackenzie College, he probably did more to endear North Americans to Brazilians than any governmental agent ever sent to that country. His funeral was the largest ever held in the city of São Paulo. As one travels

through Brazil today, he finds the name of Mackenzie College to be the key that everywhere unlocks the doors. The graduates of the school are found occupying the highest positions in official and commercial life.

What Dr. Lane was to São Paulo, H. C. Tucker, another North American, is to Rio de Janeiro. Going to Brazil forty years ago as the agent of the American Bible Society, he has so identified himself with the community that it may be said that he occupies a unique position of influence both with Brazilians and foreigners. He has so largely won the confidence of the municipality that it follows his ideas in putting in municipal playgrounds, in developing public clinics and hospitals, and in introducing modern means of sanitation and social betterment into the city's life. It was at his suggestion that the government decided to apply modern methods to the elimination of yellow fever from Rio de Janeiro.

John M. Silliman, a classmate of President Wilson at Princeton, was another of these ambassadors. For twenty or more years he lived as a "gentleman farmer" and American vice-consul at Saltillo, Mexico. His up-to-date agricultural and dairying methods were used more to help his Mexican neighbors to improve their crops than to add to his own possessions. He was first in every movement for community betterment. He was equally popular among Mexicans and Americans. On Sundays, if there was no minister to speak to the little American congregation, he would hurry from his large men's Bible class which he conducted in Spanish at the Mexican church to read one of Beecher's sermons to the Americans. And he found not only his American friends there, but a good sprinkling of Mexicans wishing to try out their English, and to be near the big man they loved.

Like these there are many other North Americans, business men, government representatives, educators, scientific experts, as well as the missionaries, who are contributing by their Christian life and contagious friendliness to a real drawing together of the Americans of the North and the South. It is difficult to refrain from mentioning by name a long list of such friends in various realms of life, who are known to be making these invaluable contributions. There are such organizations as the Rotary Clubs, now rapidly growing in South America, where Anglo-Saxons and Latins are brought together in the finest fellowship and where these spiritual ambassadors find opportunities for large service. How can they be increased?

How much it would mean if both the governmental world and the business world should keep in mind this idea of spiritual ambassadors as they select their representatives to these countries! This does not mean that they must all be "preachers," or necessarily loud in their religious professions, but ministers, real evangelists of good-will, whether business men, government agents, or representatives of philanthropic or missionary organizations. They would take very seriously the work of interpreting the best of North American life to the Latin Americans, and would bring back to their own people a realization of the lovable traits as well as the serious needs of our fellow Americans.

As we give ourselves to building a united America, we find that, fortunately, the North and the South are complements, the one to the other. This is true in the physical realm, where precisely the things that one is rich in are things the other lacks and vice versa. In the moral realm, while the North American is energetic, inventive,

resourceful, and practical, the South American is courteous, refined, open-hearted, and idealistic.

But up to the present time the moral realm has largely been obscured by the dominance of the physical. The least attractive phase of the life of the two peoples has been most generally presented to each other.

The tremendous force of a great nation, the unorganized helplessness of the small countries; the economic drive of a great industrial people and the shiftlessness and often dishonest officialdom of undeveloped countries; the natural dominance of the strong, with the equally natural suspicion of the weak; the big stick and the sullen resentment; the purely economic, materialistic forces, and the raw, unchristianized passions—these have been the elements which have been playing the largest part in Inter-American relations. The fact that these elements have been the most prominent in all international relations in the past does not excuse us in America. Here, at least, on this new continent, unhampered by all the cross-currents of the Old World, we have the largest opportunity of making spiritual forces supreme.

The whole question regarding future ventures in Inter-American friendship may be summed up thus: Shall such ventures be made on the basis of economic determinism, or on the basis of the principles of Jesus Christ? The one road leads to division, to despair, to chaos; the other leads to unity, to hope, to victory.

FOR FURTHER READING

Ariel. José E. Rodo. Tr. by Stimson. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston.

Hispanic American Relations with the United States. W. S. Robertson. Oxford University Press, New York. 1923.

Literary History of Spanish America. A. E. COESTER. Macmillan Co., New York. 1916.

Of One Blood. ROBERT E. SPEER. Missionary Education Movement, New York. 1924.

"Some Contemporary Latin American Poetry in English Verse." *Bulletin of the Pan-American Union.* July, 1924.

South America from a Surgeon's Viewpoint. F. H. MARTIN. Revell Co., New York.

"Toward a Better Pan American Understanding." JOSÉ VASCONELOS. *Bulletin of the Pan-American Union.* August, 1924.

Two Americas, The. RAFAEL REYES. Stokes Co., New York. 1914.

DATE DUE